# CONTENTS OF No. 355.


Page

ART. I.—1. Mémoires du Prince de Talleyrand. Publiés avec une Préface et des Notes par le Duc de Broglie, de l'Académie Française. Deux tomes. Paris : 1891.

2. Memoirs of the Prince de Talleyrand. Edited with a Preface and Notes by the Duc de Broglie, of the French Academy. Translated by Raphael Ledos de Beaufort, with an Introduction by the Hon. Whitelaw Reid, American Minister in Paris. Two volumes. London : 1891.

3. La Mission de Talleyrand à Londres en 1792. Ses Lettres d'Amérique à Lord Lansdowne. Avec Introduction et Notes par G. Pallain. 8vo. Paris: 1888.

4. Le Ministère de Talleyrand sous le Directoire. Avec Introduction et Notes par G. Pallain. 8vo. Paris: 1891.

5. Le Prince de Talleyrand et la Maison d'Orléans. Lettres du Roi Louis-Philippe, de Madame Adélaïde et du Prince de Talleyrand. Publiés par la Comtesse de Mirabeau. Paris: 1890. . . . . 1

II.—1. The System of the Stars. By Agnes M. Clerke, Author of 'A Popular History of Astronomy during the Nineteenth Century.' London and New York : 1890.

2. The Meteoritic Hypothesis: a Statement of the Results of a Spectroscopic Inquiry into the Origin of Cosmical Systems. By J. Norman Lockyer, F.R.S., Professor of Astronomical Physics in the Normal School of Science. London and New York : 1890. . 32

III.—1. La Vita Nuova e la Fiammetta. By R. Renier. Torino e Roma : 1879.

2. Abhandlungen über Dante Alighieri. By Dr. G. A. Scartazzini. Frankfurt : 1886.

3. Prolegomeni della Divina Commedia. By Dr. G. A. Scartazzini. Leipzig : 1890.

[And other Works.]

IV.—1. History of Phœnicia. By G. Rawlinson, M.A. London : 1889.

2. Carthage and the Carthaginians. By R. Bosworth Smith. London : 1878.

Page

3. History of Art in Phœnicia. By G. Perrot and Ch. Chipiez. English Translation. London: 1885.

4. Phœnicia. By J. Kenrick, M.A. London: 1855. . 88

V.—A Publisher and his Friends: Memoir and Correspondence of the late John Murray, with an Account of the Origin and Progress of the House (1768–1843). By Samuel Smiles, LL.D. Two volumes. 8vo. London: 1891. . . . . 121

VI.—1. Plain Tales from the Hills. London: 1890.

2. Wee Willie Winkie; Under the Deodars; The Phantom Rickshaw; and other Stories. London: 1890.

3. Soldiers Three; The Story of the Gadsbys; In Black and White. London: 1890.

4. The Light that Failed. London: 1891. . . . 132

VII.—1. London, Past and Present: its History, Associations, and Traditions. By Henry B. Wheatley, F.A.S. Based upon the 'Handbook of London,' by the late Peter Cunningham. London: 1891.

2. A History of London. By W. J. Loftie, B.A., F.A.S. With Maps and Illustrations. Third edition. London: 1891.

3. The 'Crace Collection' of Maps and Views of Old London, British Museum. . . . . 152

VIII.—1. Journal of George Fox. Seventh Edition. In 2 vols. London: 1803.

2. The Journal of John Woolman. With an Introduction by John G. Whittier. Glasgow: 1883. . . 194

[And other Works]

IX.—1. Canada and the Canadian Question. By Goldwin Smith, D.C.L. London and New York: 1891.

2. The Expansion of England: Two Courses of Lectures. By J. R. Seeley, M.A. London and New York: 1888.

3. An Essay on the Government of Dependencies. By George Cornewall Lewis, Esq. London: 1841. . 221

X.—The Melvilles, Earls of Melville, and the Leslies, Earls of Leven. By Sir William Fraser, K.C.B., LL.D. Three Volumes quarto. (Privately printed.) Edinburgh: 1890. . . . . 246

XI.—A Plea for Liberty: An Argument against Socialism and Socialistic Legislation, consisting of an Introduction by Herbert Spencer and Essays by various Writers. Edited by Thomas Mackay, Author of 'The English Poor.' London: 1891. . . . 271

[And other Works.]

# CONTENTS OF No. 358.


Page

ART. I.—Private Correspondence of Sir Robert Peel, 1788–1827. Edited by Charles Stuart Parker, M.P. London: 1891, . . . . . 295

II.—1. Forty Years in a Moorland Parish: Reminiscences and Researches in Danby-in-Cleveland. By the Rev. J. C. Atkinson, D.C.L. London: 1891.

2. History of Cleveland, Ancient and Modern. By the Rev. J. C. Atkinson. Barrow-in-Furness: 1874.

3. A Glossary of the Cleveland Dialect: Explanatory, Derivative, and Critical. By the Rev. J. C. Atkinson. London: 1868, . . . . . 328

III.—A History of the 'Old Water-Colour Society,' now the Royal Society of Painters in Water Colours. By John Lewis Roget. Two Volumes. 8vo. London: 1891, . . . . . 349

IV.—The Writings of James Russell Lowell. In ten Volumes. 12mo. Riverside Edition. Republished in London, 1890, . . . . . 377

V.—Fortification. By Major G. S. Clarke, R.E., C.M.G. 8vo. London: 1891, . . . . . 404

VI.—Une Année de ma Vie, 1848–9. Par le Comte de Hübner, ancien Ambassadeur d'Autriche à Paris et à Rome. 8vo. Paris: 1891, . . . 440

VII.—Life of Archibald Campbell Tait, Archbishop of Canterbury. By Randall Thomas Davidson, D.D., Dean of Windsor; and William Benham, B.D., Hon. Canon of Canterbury. 2 vols. London: 1891, . . . . . 462

VIII.—1. General Gordon's Events in the Taeping Rebellion. London: 1891.

2. Translations from the 'Pekin Gazette' for 1890; 'North China Herald.' Shanghai: 1891.

3. Correspondence respecting Anti-Foreign Riots in China. (China: No. 3, 1891.)

4. China, Religious and Moral. By G. Eug. Simon. London: 1887, . . . . . 493

Page

IX.—1. Rosbach and Jena. By Baron Colmar von der Goltz.

2. Field-Marshal von Moltke. By Professor W. Müller.

3. Le Maréchal de Moltke, Organisateur et Stratège. By General Lewal. 'Journal des Sciences Militaires.' Paris: May, 1891.

4. Collected Works of Count von Moltke. Vol. III. Berlin. 1891.

5. Great Commanders of Modern Times. By W. O'Connor Morris. London: 1891, . . 528

X.—Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 1886–1891, . . 566

THE

# EDINBURGH REVIEW,

JULY, 1891.

## No. CCCLV.

ART. I.—1. *Mémoires du Prince de Talleyrand.* Publiés avec une Préface et des Notes par le Duc de BROGLIE, de l'Académie Française. Deux tomes. Paris: 1891.

2. *Memoirs of the Prince de Talleyrand.* Edited with a Preface and Notes by the Duc de BROGLIE, of the French Academy. Translated by RAPHAEL LEDOS DE BEAUFORT, with an Introduction by the Honble. WHITELAW REID, American Minister in Paris. Two volumes. London: 1891.

3. *La Mission de Talleyrand à Londres en* 1792. *Ses Lettres d'Amérique à Lord Lansdowne.* Avec Introduction et Notes par G. PALLAIN. 8vo. Paris: 1888.

4. *Le Ministère de Talleyrand sous le Directoire.* Avec Introtion et Notes par G. PALLAIN. 8vo. Paris: 1891.

5. *Le Prince de Talleyrand et la Maison d'Orléans. Lettres du Roi Louis-Philippe, de Madame Adélaïde et du Prince de Talleyrand.* Publiés par la Comtesse de MIRABEAU. Paris: 1890.

No one, we believe, who opens the volumes which stand foremost at the head of this article will find in them what was expected. A false importance had been given to them by the long and eminent career of the writer, and by the singular and wholly unnecessary precautions taken to defer for half a century the publication of the work. When the veil of mystery in which they were enshrouded was withdrawn, it turned out that, by the express

declaration of the author, the book is not a literary work at all, and can scarcely be called 'Memoirs,' since his own life and adventures are mentioned in it as seldom as he could help. It contains no narrative; it is enlivened by no flashes of wit, and few anecdotes; it throws no original light on the historical events in which Talleyrand played so important a part. It is more remarkable for what it omits than for what it relates. The work might more fitly be entitled 'My opinions on some passages of contemporary 'history.' M. de Talleyrand had no literary experience; he makes no attempt to give a connected interest to his work. It is totally deficient even in chronological arrangement. It was well known that he wrote with difficulty, and even repugnance, and that most of his despatches and letters were dictated to his secretaries. These papers bear marks of the same process. They give us the impression of an old man recalling in conversation some of the incidents of his life, and dwelling less on his conduct than on his opinions, which he discusses at length—sometimes as an economist, sometimes as a moralist. But we do not find in them any attempt to explain, or even to notice, the most serious charges which have been brought against his own personal and political conduct. On the one hand, they contain no apology; on the other hand, they by no means justify the intemperate and abusive Introduction which Mr. Whitelaw Reid has thought fit to prefix to the English translation.

The result of these facts is that the public finds little or nothing in these volumes to excite a lively interest or to gratify curiosity. The world is disappointed and the work is condemned as dull, before the reader has had time to master or appreciate its contents. It is curious that the two statesmen who had the longest experience and the widest knowledge of European affairs—Prince Metternich and Prince Talleyrand—should both have left us a record of their times which will hold no prominent place in literature or history. Nevertheless, it may be shown that this adverse judgement is in some respects hasty and exaggerated. Even these fragmentary memoirs of Talleyrand throw more light on his own character. They show that he was not only a man of action, but a statesman who thought with rare sagacity on political questions, not only of diplomacy, but of finance, political economy, and legislation; and that, although he bent to every gust of the revolutionary period in which he lived, his own opinions never materially varied from those he inherited or had formed in early life; and that in all his

disguises he remained a born aristocrat, despising in his heart not only those below him, but those above him, and mortally distrusting democratic government, of which he had seen too much; a staunch believer in monarchy, whoever might be the monarch, but on constitutional principles; and even a well-wisher to the Church, although he had been a most reluctant priest and became a secularised bishop.

Madame de Staël called Talleyrand an 'undecipherable 'man.' He presents the phenomenon, which some works of fiction have attempted to describe, of a dual nature. He had a mind to conceive large and enlightened views of liberal government. He was a friend to moderation and to peace. He knew the danger and the worthlessness of the revolutionary propaganda which made Europe the enemy of France, and of the territorial conquests which made Europe her slave. But from a singular absence of moral energy and dignity he placed his rare intelligence at the service of men whom he despised and of actions which he condemned. Hence he shared, at least indirectly, in the political crimes of the Directory and the Empire, with a full knowledge of their true nature; and when the day of reckoning came, and their consequences became apparent, he silently abandoned the powers he had served, and transferred his influence, like a *condottiere* in politics, to the opposite faction. The more the records of his life are made known, not in these 'Memoirs' only, but still more in his official correspondence, which has been recently published by M. Pallain, the higher does our estimate of his intelligence and sagacity rise, and the lower is the standard of his moral faculties. Innumerable details may be found, in the memoirs of the time, of the wit, the artifices, the intrigues, and the cupidity of M. de Talleyrand. But these tricks do not make a statesman, capable of guiding the affairs of Europe; and we prefer to direct the attention of our readers to the more solid qualities which marked a great career.

This then is, in our opinion, the substantial value of the work before us. Talleyrand was one of the few survivors of the great catastrophe.* He alone had to take an active

* It deserves to be noted that three men of light and leading, who were pre-eminent in the National Assembly, Talleyrand, Sieyès, and Rœderer, were all born in the middle of the eighteenth century (1748–1754), and all lived to pass their eightieth year. Two of them were priests. Rœderer was a lawyer. They witnessed the events of 1830,

part in all the memorable events of an age. He witnessed the august ceremony of the coronation of Louis XVI. at Reims, being then in priest's orders; and he exclaims in his old age, with pathetic eloquence—

'Quelle époque brillante! Un jeune roi d'une morale scrupuleuse, d'une modestie rare; des ministres connus par leurs lumières et leur probité; une reine dont l'affabilité, les grâces, la bonté tempéraient l'austérité des vertus de son époux; tout était respect! tout était amour! tout était fêtes. . . . Jamais printemps si brillant n'a précédé un automne si orageux, un hiver si funeste!' (P. 23.)

The first ten years of the King's reign were the most animated period of French society. The young Abbé de Périgord revelled in the luxuries and the licence of the times; he belonged to the 'clergé un peu dissipé,' on whom the rule of their order sate very lightly. His memory carries him back to the mornings when Lauzun, Delille, Mirabeau, Chamfort, Choiseul-Gouffier, and Louis de Narbonne were wont to meet at his breakfast table in his small rooms, Rue Bellechasse. What conversation! What a company of friends! 'On y parlait un peu de tout, et avec 'la plus grande liberté. C'étaient des matinées excellentes 'pour lesquelles je me sentirais encore du goût.' If you wish to know more of the freaks and follies of the Abbé, and even Bishop, you will find them recorded in Gouverneur Morris's inimitable diaries, where Monseigneur is seen to warm Madame de Flahaut's bed with 'a warming pan.' If you wish to learn what feelings of tenderness and friendship lay beneath the crust of an ambitious, worldly, and even profligate life, you may turn to the picture Madame de Rémusat has left us of one of the more genial and honourable intimacies of his later years. But of these things this book says nothing, and we shall say no more. It is mainly a record of opinions and judgements on political events and public affairs, designed to show that an extreme mobility and even inconsistency of conduct may be compatible with some definite principles of action. In revolutionary times M. de Talleyrand held that no Government, as such, could *claim* an *indissoluble allegiance*, the Governments themselves being transitory and ephemeral, all perishing in succession by their own faults. He therefore attached to

---

which appeared to be the realisation of their hopes of constitutional government, and they deemed the Revolution to be finally closed, not foreseeing that in another generation it was destined to resume its fatal course.

his last will a profession of political opinion, which may be taken as a general defence of his conduct in life, and which forms an appropriate introduction to these remarks.

Having been secularised by the Pope, he adds:—

'I considered myself free, and my situation required that I should find my way. I did so alone, for I did not wish my future to be linked to any political party, for they none of them tallied with my views. I carefully considered the matter and decided on serving France for her sake alone, in whatever situation she might be placed: some good was to be done in each. Therefore I do not blame myself for having served all the political parties which ruled France, from the Directory to the government existing at the time of my writing this. After the horrors of the Revolution, all that was calculated to lead, one way or the other, to order and security was useful; and, at that time, sensible men could wish for nothing more.

'To restore monarchical institutions was a matter of impossibility in the state in which France then was. To do so, intermediate forms of government—several of them—were needed. One could not expect even the shadow of royalty in the Directory; the spirit of the Convention must predominate there, and so it did, in reality, though in a milder form: but, by reason of this spirit, that government was not to last long. It paved the way for the Consulate, which already contained the principle of royalty, though as yet in disguise. Some good was to be done there; that form of government possessed a remote, it is true, but real resemblance to monarchy.

'The imperial rule which followed was more like an autocracy than a regular monarchy. This is true, but at the time when Bonaparte put the crown on his head, war with England was raging again; other wars were imminent; the spirit of faction was rampant, and the safety of the country might have been jeopardised if its ruler had confined himself to the exercise of the sole prerogatives of a simple king. I therefore served the Emperor Napoleon, as I had done the Consul Bonaparte: I served him with loyalty, so long as I could believe him exclusively devoted to France. But, as soon as I saw him enter on the revolutionary path which led him to ruin, I left the cabinet, and for that he never forgave me.

'In 1814, the Bourbons, with whom, since 1791, I had had no relations, were recalled. They were so, for the only reason that their reign was deemed more favourable than any other to the rest so much needed by France and by Europe. I have related, in my *Memoirs*, the chief part I played in that great event, and the rather bold steps I took in those memorable days. The recall of the princes of the House of Bourbon was not the acknowledgement of pre-existing rights. If they so construed it, it was neither on my advice, nor with my assent; for here is my opinion on the matter.

'Monarchs are such only by virtue of public instruments which constitute them the heads of civil society. These instruments are, it is true, irrevocable for each monarch and for his posterity so long as the reigning monarch keeps within the limits of his own province; but if

he attempts to go beyond it, he loses all right to a title which his own acts either have belied or would soon belie. Such being my opinion, I have never found it necessary to disclaim it in order to accept the functions which I have discharged under various governments.

'As I now, in my eighty-second year, call to mind the numerous events of my political life, which has itself been long, and weigh them on the eve of entering into eternity, I find as the result:—

'That of all the governments I have served, there is not one to which I have not given more than I have received.

'That I have never abandoned any, till it had, first of all, abandoned itself.

'That I have never considered the interest of any party, my own, or those of my friends, before the *true* interests of France, which besides are never, in my opinion, contrary to the *true* interests of Europe.' (Vol. i. pp. viii–x.)

This profession of political faith or faithlessness (for it may have either sense) is followed by the very precise directions given by the Prince to M. de Bacourt and the Duchesse de Sagan, with reference to the ultimate publication of the 'Memoirs,' after an interval fixed by the writer at thirty years. Both these literary legatees died, as was not improbable, before that term expired, and the manuscripts passed into the hands of a notary and an *avocat* (M. Andral), named by them, and subsequently to the present Duc de Broglie. But M. de Bacourt had employed the years which elapsed between the death of M. de Talleyrand and his own in sedulously collecting, arranging, annotating, and even copying with his own hand these so-called 'Memoirs.' He also extended the term of publication to fifty years. The result of his labours is contained in four folio volumes, described in M. de Bacourt's will as—

'Quatre volumes, reliés en peau, qui sont la seule copie authentique et complète des *Mémoires* du Prince de Talleyrand, faite par M. de Bacourt d'après les manuscrits, les dictées et les copies dont M. de Talleyrand lui avait indiqué l'emploi.'

The Duchesse de Sagan annexed to each volume a similar voucher. These, then, are the papers transmitted to the Duc de Broglie, the first part of which he has now given to the world with, we doubt not, the most complete and scrupulous fidelity. But it must strike every reader that what we have before us is M. de Bacourt's *copy*. Madame de Sagan calls it 'la seule *copie* originale, complète et 'fidèle' of the Memoirs; and the word 'copie' in French means strictly a thing copied, and not, as it might in English, a duplicate of the work. From what, then, was this copy

made? And where are the original manuscripts, whether written or dictated by the Prince? It is not credible that M. de Bacourt should have destroyed the materials which he had collected and on which he worked. We have no doubt that he discharged with conscientious fidelity his duty as editor of the papers, which were probably left in a confused state, some in France and some, we believe, in England. But the work of an editor is a mere superstructure on the work of the author; and it would be satisfactory to know that the words '*copie originale*, complète et 'fidèle' apply not only to M. de Bacourt's 'four volumes 'bound in leather,' but to the documents of the Prince which his literary executors must have had before them, and that these documents are still in existence, as it is possible that they may contain matter which M. de Bacourt did not copy or reserve for publication. The responsibility of the Duc de Broglie is, of course, strictly limited to the reproduction of the copy placed in his hands. No one doubts the authenticity of what is now published. But some further evidence is required to establish the integrity and completeness of the copy made by M. de Bacourt; and we should be glad to know how far the writings of the Prince were 'arranged' by his executors.'

M. de Talleyrand had a miserable childhood. At four years old the clumsiness of a nurse lamed him for life, and sent him halting into the world. Neglected by his parents, whom he scarcely ever saw, the only member of his family who showed him any marks of affection was his great-grandmother, Madame de Chalais, with whom he spent at Chalais his early boyhood, where he learnt to read and write, and speak the *patois* of the Charente. At eight he was transferred for some years to the Collège d'Harcourt, where he was to learn as little as became a high-born nobleman of that day; and thence eventually to St.-Sulpice to prepare for the priesthood, into which he was thrust without the slightest inclination of his own.

'I spent three years at Saint-Sulpice College, and hardly spoke at all during the whole time; people thought I was supercilious and often reproached me with doing so. This seemed to me so to point out how little they knew me, that I deigned no reply; they then said that my arrogance was beyond all endurance. Good Heavens! I was neither arrogant nor proud: I was merely a harmless young man, extremely miserable and inwardly irritated. *People say*, I often thought to myself, *that I am fit for nothing*. . . . Fit for nothing. . . . After giving

way to despondency, for a few moments, a strong and comforting feeling cheered me, and I discovered *that I was fit for something, even for good and noble deeds.* What forebodings, a thousand times dispelled, did not then cross my mind, always placing me under a spell which I was unable to explain!

'The library of Saint-Sulpice College had been enriched by gifts from Cardinal de Fleury; its works were numerous and carefully selected. I spent my days there reading the productions of great historians, the private lives of statesmen and moralists, and a few poets. I was particularly fond of books of travels. A new land, the dangers of a storm, the picture of a wreck, the description of a country bearing traces of great changes, sometimes of upheavals, all this had deep interest for me. Sometimes, when I considered these voyages to distant lands, these dreadful scenes described so vividly in the writings of modern explorers, it seemed to me that my lot was not so hopeless as I had thought. A good library affords true comfort to all the dispositions of the soul.

'My third and really useful education dates from this time, it was self-taught in lonely silence; as I was always face to face with the author whose work I was reading, and could only use my own judgement, it nearly always happened that, when my opinions differed from those of another, I thought mine the right one. My ideas thus remained personally my own: the books I read enlightened my mind, but never enslaved it. I do not pretend to say that in so acting I was right or wrong, I merely state what I was. Such lonely self-tuition must have some value. If injustice, whilst developing our faculties, has not embittered our hearts too much, we derive greater comfort from lofty thoughts and noble impulses, we feel stronger in confronting life's trials. A feeling of hope, vague and indescribable, like all youthful passions, excited my mind: I never allowed it to rest.' (Vol. i. pp. 15, 16.)

These years at St.-Sulpice were years of self-education to the young aspirant, and he must have made an uncommon use of them, not indeed with a view to his sacred profession, but to the business of life, for he seems to have emerged from the cloister a financier, an economist, and a politician. The Church, he soon discovered, had also its politics and its temporal affairs, and to these subjects he without reluctance devoted himself.

In 1775, at the age of twenty-one, he was elected a member of the assembly of the clergy for the province of Reims, and made by his uncle, Cardinal de la Roche-Aymon, the Promoter of that assembly. This led to his becoming Agent-General of the Clergy, an office which consisted in representing the interests of that body in all that related to the revenues and privileges of the Church. The details of these transactions have lost their interest, but they show

that Talleyrand entered upon his duties at once in the spirit of a reformer and an economist. He proposed the suppression of lotteries. He advocated an increase of the stipend of the lower clergy, and he watched over the interests of his colleagues at the Bank of Discount, and even drew up the report on that institution for the shareholders.

'This was the first time that I was, strictly speaking, connected with public affairs. I prefaced my report by a speech in which I had applied myself to set forth all the advantages of public credit; I laid stress on its importance; I established the fact that all was possible to one who possessed a large credit; that credit alone suffices for all the needs of commerce, of large trading establishments, of manufactures, and so on. After having set forth all the advantages of credit, I spoke of the means of obtaining and of preserving it. I remember that, in this paper, I was so pleased to make known all the various uses of which credit is susceptible, that I made use of a host of expressions which are only employed to depict the most timid and delicate sentiments. An old banker, named Rilliet, a regular Genevese, who listened to me with attention, learned with extreme pleasure, which he expressed by the roughest gestures, that, in paying exactly his bills of exchange, he did something so very fine that it could only be expressed in the language of imagination. He came to me, and begged me as he pressed my hands to allow him to copy that part of my speech. His enthusiasm became useful, for he repeated so badly what I had just said, that I deemed it quite out of place, and left it out in the printed text.

'From the advantages of credit, and the means of obtaining it, I turned at last to the special institutions which facilitate, accelerate, and simplify all its transactions while hastening and ensuring its progress.' (Vol. i. p. 43.)

After this exordium the reader will not be surprised, though he may be disappointed, to find that the first part of this work is mainly devoted to questions of political economy, and that he must begin his acquaintance with the future diplomatist and statesman in the guise of a financier. But it is eminently characteristic of the practical intelligence of Talleyrand that he discusses all these questions with a freedom and originality far ahead of the times preceding the Revolution. This semi-clerical priest, on whom Pius VI. would have bestowed a cardinal's hat but for the interposition of Marie Antoinette, who was always his enemy, had mastered the intricacies of banking, credit, currency, trade, and taxation. He was a declared free-trader; he anticipated the extension of French commercial interests in the Mediterranean; and he desired to maintain a sort of level between the industries of all civilised countries. On

the eve of the meeting of the Assembly of Notables M. de Calonne had, with his usual negligence and presumption, neglected to prepare the reports he was called upon to make to that body. Nothing existed but a few memoranda. Talleyrand and his friends, at the request of the minister, set to work. Talleyrand wrote the report and bill on the corn law, and contributed to those on the payment of the debts of the clergy and on statute labour. In a week they accomplished with tolerable success a task which M. de Calonne had neglected for five months.

Such was the foundation of the high repute which Talleyrand had at an early age acquired as a man of business. He entered the Constituent Assembly as an economist rather than a politician, and the numerous measures of reform which he proposed there were all of a practical character. These details are not amusing, but they are of value to history, and they justify the influence Talleyrand acquired in the Assembly, although he has said less of his career there than might be desired. In that body there were four men on whom the destinies of France might be said to depend: Necker, still in power, Lafayette, Mirabeau, and Talleyrand; two of them men of good character, but weak abilities; two of them men of great ability, but indifferent private character. To these names we ought in justice to add those of Sieyès and Roederer, who were superior to Talleyrand and Mirabeau as men of letters, but inferior as men of action and of influence. In October 1789 an attempt was made to form an administration which should include several of them. In that administration Talleyrand was to have been the Minister of Finance, or of Foreign Affairs. The project failed from the mutual distrust of these eminent persons, all of whom were equally detested by the Court. No government could be formed. Louis XVI. remained virtually without a minister, and the Revolution ran its course. It had, Talleyrand says, 'no authors, no 'leaders, and no guides.'

It is not a little singular that Talleyrand retained the bishopric of Autun till 1791, and in that capacity, as consecrating prelate, he transmitted the apostolical succession to the first two constitutional bishops. He shortly afterwards resigned his bishopric, and was eventually released by the Pope from his orders. 'I placed myself at the disposition 'of events, and, provided I remained a Frenchman, all else 'contented me. The Revolution promised new destinies to 'the nation; I followed its course, and I ran my chance.'

In the Constituent Assembly M. de Talleyrand belonged to no political party. He was too liberal a reformer for the monarchists; he condemned the emigration; and he foresaw that the cause of monarchy was already lost. But he abhorred the violence of the revolutionary party, and dreaded the fate impending over the royal family. He seems to have thought that the best chance of saving the King lay in the possibility of obtaining from foreign powers a promise of disarmament and a policy of neutrality, and for this purpose he went to London.

It is much to be regretted that in these papers M. de Talleyrand has left no record of that important and interesting journey, but fortunately this omission is amply compensated by the publication of his own official correspondence from London, which we owe to the researches of M. Pallain in the French archives.

These documents, which are *bona fide* contemporary history, are far more valuable than any part of the 'Memoirs' themselves. Talleyrand arrived in London on January 21, 1792. His mission bore a private character, because, as a member of the National Assembly, he could not hold any public office or appointment, and his only credential was a note of introduction from M. de Lessart to Lord Grenville in these words:—

'Comme il a été à portée d'étudier nos rapports politiques, surtout ceux que nous avons avec l'Angleterre, je désire que Votre Excellence veuille bien s'en entretenir avec lui, et je suis assuré d'avance qu'il la convaincra de notre désir de maintenir et de fortifier la bonne intelligence qui subsiste entre les deux royaumes.'

There is some confusion in the very cursory notice of this important mission in the 'Memoirs' and in the note affixed to it by the translator. Talleyrand came twice to London. In January he arrived, accompanied by the Duc de Biron, in a private capacity. He returned to Paris on March 9, and arrived in the midst of a ministerial crisis. M. de Lessart had been removed, and was succeeded by Dumouriez. On April 20 a second mission was despatched. Chauvelin was then duly appointed Minister to the Court of London with a letter from Louis XVI. to George III., in which it was expressly stated that M. de Talleyrand was associated with the Minister. It was perfectly understood that Chauvelin, who was young, was to be the mere figure-head of the mission, and that Talleyrand was to conduct the negotiation. The instructions to the two diplomatists were in all probability drawn up by

Talleyrand himself. They are now published by M. Pallain, and are a very masterly State paper. Talleyrand returned to Paris in July, just before the events which frustrated all his hopes of peace. Chauvelin remained in London, but with no diplomatic character after the dethronement of the King.

In the spring of 1792 the French Revolution had not acquired the intense violence and brutality which marked the close of that year. Louis XVI. was still on the throne; the Constitution of 1791 was in force; war had not yet broken out, though it was evidently impending on the Continent. M. de Talleyrand was courteously received on his first arrival by Lord Grenville and Mr. Pitt. He was presented at Court, where the King was cold and the Queen uncivil. The intimacies he contracted were chiefly with the leading members of the Whig party, who sympathised with the Revolution in France, and perhaps this circumstance told against his influence with the Government. But he found in the English ministers a sincere desire to maintain peace. The military estimates had just been reduced; and they listened with favour to his eloquent plea for the neutrality of this country, which was, in fact, their own policy. The hope of establishing a close union between France and England on the basis of liberal constitutional principles and common commercial interests had been emphatically proclaimed by Mirabeau, and, after his death, M. de Talleyrand inherited that policy. In spite of all that occurred in subsequent years, when Talleyrand was the unscrupulous adviser of our worst enemies, we trace throughout his career the fixed opinion that the alliance of France and England is essential to their security and to the peace of the world. This was the cause he pleaded with consummate ability and eloquence in the long conversation with Lord Grenville which he reports, literally, to M. de Lessart in his despatch of February 17, 1792. We wish it were possible, within our limits, to quote that masterly paper.* It gives a higher impression of his ability than anything to be found in his later reminiscences. He pleaded for the neutrality of England in the approaching contest, but the neutral proclamation of May 25 would probably have been issued in any case on the breaking out of war on the Continent; and it is a mistake to suppose (with M. Sybel) that it was extorted from the British Government by Talleyrand, or that it affected the independence of the

* See Pallain's 'Mission de Talleyrand à Londres,' p. 98.

Low Countries, or that, as has been stated, any treaty of neutrality was signed. He strenuously urged upon Lord Grenville the abolition of the practice of privateering, which he had previously attacked in the National Assembly with some success.

On July 5, however, he returned to Paris, only to witness the overthrow of whatever hopes of a peaceful settlement remained. August 10 dethroned the King, destroyed the Constitution, and let loose the revolutionary torrent. There was nothing left to defend, and within a few days his own life would have been in imminent danger. Talleyrand succeeded with some difficulty in obtaining from Danton a passport for England, under pretext of treating a question of weights and measures, and he left his country, not as an *émigré*, but as a patriot in exile, who, for the time, had lost the last chance of saving the monarchy and maintaining peace. M. de Lessart, with whom he had corresponded from London during his first mission, perished in the massacres of September 2, a few days afterwards.

'I solicited a temporary mission to London from the provisory executive. As the object of my mission, I chose a scientific question with which I was somewhat entitled to deal, seeing that it related to a motion previously made by me in the Constituent Assembly. My aim was to establish for the whole kingdom a uniform system of weights and measures. After the exactitude of this system had been vouched for by the most competent men of Europe, it might have been adopted by the different nations. It was therefore advisable to confer with England on the subject.

'My real object was, however, to leave France, where it seemed to me useless, and even dangerous, to stay any longer, but I wished to leave the country with a regular passport, in order that it should not be closed to me for ever.

'As in France, the tide of political passions ran high in the various cabinets of Europe. It was thought that if she were attacked on all sides, France could not resist. Only dreaming of success, they decided to wage war against her. The advantages they expected to reap by their victory were such as to cause them to lose sight of the dangers of the royal family. It was then that the Republicans, seeing war inevitable, took the initiative in declaring it, in order to show that they were not afraid of it.

'I resided in England during the whole of the dreadful year 1793 and a portion of 1794. There I was welcomed with the utmost kindness by the Marquis of Lansdowne, whom I had known in Paris; he was a nobleman of lofty views, gifted with abundant and lively powers of elocution. He was still free from the infirmities of old age. Some people brought against him the commonplace accusation of being *too clever*; an accusation by means of which, in England as well as in

France, people keep at a distance all the men whose superiority gives them umbrage, and this is really the only reason why he never was in office again. I saw him often, and he kindly sent me word every time he received the visit of some distinguished person whose acquaintance he thought I should be pleased to make. It was at his house that I met Mr. Hastings, and the doctors Price and Priestley; there, I also formed an intimacy with Mr. Canning, Mr. Romilly, Mr. Robert Smith, M. Dumont, Mr. Bentham, and Lord Henry Petty, the son of Lord Lansdowne, who at this time was already looked upon as one of the hopes of England. All the friends of Mr. Fox, with which gentleman I had, on several occasions, been on intimate terms, did their best to render my stay in London as pleasant as possible.' (Vol. i. pp. 169–171.)

He was therefore a remote spectator of the horrors of 1793–94, and he alleges that these excesses of popular fury leave, and deserve to leave, no impression on the mind. To so frigid and methodical a politician a revolutionary eruption had no meaning. It was a temporary phenomenon. His duty was to stand aside till it had passed away.

'I confess that it would not cause me the slightest concern if the details of this awful calamity were to leave no trace in men's minds, for they are of no historical importance. Indeed, what teachings could men derive from deeds performed without aim or plan, and which were merely the outcome of ruthless and unruly passions?

'Teachings of all kinds are rather to be sought in the knowledge of the facts preceding the catastrophe, and for the investigation of which every material exists; this knowledge will disclose the numerous and weighty causes of the revolution; this is the truly profitable way of unfolding men's actions, for it bears with itself lessons equally useful to sovereigns, to the upper and to the lower classes. (Vol. i. p. 172.)

But he expressed very decidedly in a letter to Lord Lansdowne, dated from Kensington Square, October 3, 1792, what he thought of the recent events in Paris. The passage is worth quoting in the original:—

'Quand on a passé les deux derniers mois à Paris, on a bien besoin de venir se retremper dans la conversation des hommes supérieurs. Dans un moment où l'on a tout dénaturé, tout perverti, les hommes qui restent fidèles à la liberté malgré le masque de sang et de boue dont d'atroces polissons ont voilé les traîts, sont en nombre excessivement petit. . . . Comprimés depuis deux ans entre la terreur et les défiances, les Français ont pris l'habitude des esclaves, qui est de ne dire que ce qu'on peut dire sans danger. Les clubs et les piques tuent l'énergie, habituent à la dissimulation, à la bassesse, et si on laisse contracter au peuple cette infâme habitude il ne verra d'autre bonheur que de changer de tyran.' (Pallain, Mission de Talleyrand, p. 419.)

It has never been explained why the British Government ordered Talleyrand to leave the country, which sheltered so many *émigrés*, and where he had so many friends—all, indeed, of the Whig party. He certainly was not an agent of the Revolution, and his life would not have been worth a day's purchase if he had been cast upon the shore of France. Leaving England, he embarked for the United States, the more willingly as he was passionately fond of the sea. The wide horizon of the ocean, the steady progress of the vessel, were congenial to his silent but somewhat melancholy meditations. When M. de Talleyrand left England for America, in March 1794, the Marquis of Lansdowne gave him a letter of introduction to President Washington, in which the following expressions occur:—

'M. de Talleyrand is the eldest son of one of the first families in France. He was bred to the Church on account of an accidental lameness at his birth, and must have succeeded to the highest honours and emoluments if he had not sacrificed his ambition to public principle, in which, however, he preserves so much moderation as never to pass the line of a constitutionalist, which exposes him to the hatred of the violent party now predominating. He has resided in England near three years, during which time he has conducted himself, to my intimate knowledge, with the strictest public and private propriety, so as to give not the slightest cause of jealousy.'

The letter is published in the 'Life of Lord Shelburne,' by Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, vol. iii. p. 515. It did not, however, produce the desired effect; Washington did not receive M. de Talleyrand: probably because he was at that very time engaged in embarrassing negotiations with the French Minister in the United States.

No pages in these volumes are so gracefully written in the original, or are to us so interesting, as M. de Talleyrand's personal recollections of the United States as he saw them nearly a hundred years ago, and within five years of the establishment of the Federal Union. They combine a vivid picture of that forest-clad unexplored land with a most sagacious forecast of the future character of the American people. On leaving Philadelphia to travel inland,

'I was struck with astonishment; at less than a hundred and fifty miles' distance from the capital, all trace of men's presence disappeared; nature in all her primeval vigour confronted us. Forests old as the world itself; decayed plants and trees covering the very ground where they once grew in luxuriance; others shooting forth from under the *débris* of the former, and like them destined to decay and rot; thick and intricate bushes that often barred our progress; green and luxu-

riant grass decking the banks of rivers; large natural meadows; strange and delicate flowers quite new to me; and here and there the traces of former tornadoes that had carried everything before them. Enormous trees, all mowed down in the same direction, extending for a considerable distance, bear witness to the wonderful force of these terrible phenomena. On reaching higher ground, our eyes wandered, as far as the sight could range, over a most varied and pleasant picture. The tops of trees and the undulations of the ground which alone interfere with the uniform aspect of large extents of country, produce a peculiar effect. In the face of these immense solitudes, we gave free vent to our imagination; our minds built cities, villages, and hamlets; the mountain forests were to remain untouched, the slopes of the hills to be covered with luxuriant crops, and we could almost fancy we saw numerous herds of cattle grazing in the valley under our eyes. There is an inexpressible charm in thinking of the future when travelling in such countries. Such, said I to myself, was the place where, not very many years ago, Penn and two thousand emigrants laid the foundations of Philadelphia, and where a population of eighty thousand people is now enjoying all the luxuries of Europe. Such was also the site now occupied by the pretty little town of Bethlehem, whose neat houses and wonderfully fertile environs, due to the energy of the Moravian brothers, excite the admiration of all visitors. After the peace of 1783, the city of Baltimore was but a fishing village; now spacious and elegant dwellings have there been built everywhere, and dispute the ground with trees whose stumps have not yet been removed. It is impossible to move a step without feeling convinced that the irresistible progressive march of nature requires an immense population to cultivate some day this large extent of ground lying idle now indeed, but which only wants the hand of man to produce everything in abundance. I leave to others the satisfaction of foretelling the prospects of those countries. I confine myself to noticing that it is impossible to walk a few miles away from seaside towns without learning that the lovely and fertile fields we now admire were, but ten, but five, but a couple of years ago, mere wildernesses of forest. Similar causes must produce similar effects, especially when acting with ever increasing power. The population of the States will therefore daily reclaim some fresh portion of these fallow spaces, the area of which far surpasses that of the ground at present cultivated.' (Vol. i. pp. 176–178.)

After remarking that agriculture is the chief wealth of society, and the surest barrier against revolutions, because it furnishes constant proofs of the grand results of simple, regular work, which neither hurries nor delays in anything, he adds:—

'In times of revolutions, rashness is regarded as skill, and exaggeration as greatness. To put a stop to them, circumspection must replace audacity, and greatness will then lie in moderation, and skill in prudence. A government, which is the friend of liberty and averse to

disturbing the tranquillity of the world, must strive to act with moderation. An agricultural nation settles down, it does not wish for conquests. Commerce, on the other hand, always longs for increase of territory.' (Vol. i. p. 179.)

He therefore laments the tendency of the American people, which he already remarked, to the spirit of commercial enterprise and speculation, and to the sordid and debasing pursuit of money, whilst 'nine-tenths of the five hundred 'millions of acres, comprising the territory of North America, 'are still untilled; and he adds that too much activity is 'devoted to business and not enough to farming, and this 'first impulse given to all the ideas of the country unsettles 'its social establishment.'

In the course of the two winters Talleyrand spent in Philadelphia and New York, he made the acquaintance of Alexander Hamilton, whose mind and character placed him, he thought, on a par with the most distinguished statesmen of Europe, not even excepting Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox; and he records a remarkable conversation in which the French visitor defended the principles of free trade, and hoped that a time would come to introduce 'liberal equality into the 'intercourse of nations.' He pointed out the manifest advantage of an exchange between the crops of America and the manufactures of Europe. But Hamilton was a strong protectionist. He contended that the United States only needed two markets, one for the Northern and one for the Southern States, and that these must be created within their own boundaries. In fact, he anticipated the M'Kinley tariff by almost a century. Talleyrand remarks:—

'I do not know whether they will ever be realised, but if they do, it will only be when the intrusive and invading spirit of America will have ceased to alter the general relations of the American people with other nations, and when, by a judicious regard for its own interests, it will endeavour to conquer its own country by turning to every possible advantage the vast extent of territory belonging to it.' (Vol. i. p. 185.)

We are indebted to M. Pallain (or rather to the present Marquis of Lansdowne) for an elaborate letter to the first Marquis, dated from Philadelphia in February 1795, in which he argues that in spite of the services rendered by France to the Americans, and in spite of the lingering resentment caused by the War of Independence, it was not to France, but to England, that the true inclinations of the American people must point. His conclusion is that 'America is English, and that England, not France, may

'derive from the United States all the benefit which one 'nation can derive from the existence of another.' There is, he says, in the representative Constitution of England a good deal of republic, and a good deal of monarchy in the Executive Power of the Union. The Anglo-Saxon nations are drawn together by their common language, by their laws, and above all by their interest. France has nothing of the kind to offer; and the French ministers, M. Ternan and M. Genet, had intrigued against the Union and endeavoured to introduce Jacobinism into the United States. These are remarkable opinions coming from a French statesman in Philadelphia, and we are tempted to quote them, because the 'Memoirs' now published contain but little of equal interest.

In 1796 a decree of the Convention authorised M. de Talleyrand to return to France, and he reached Paris in September of that year. He still stood aloof from politics, and it deserves to be noted that his first occupation was the reorganisation of the Institute (which had been suppressed in 1792), and especially of the 'Académie des Sciences 'Morales et Politiques,' of which he was an original member. He read to that learned body two papers on the colonial interests of France. Forty years afterwards his last literary effort was the admirable *éloge* of M. Reinhard, which is published in the second volume of the 'Transactions' of that Academy—a very remarkable, and in some respects an autobiographical, paper.

Madame de Staël was anxious that he should make the acquaintance of Barras, then a leading member of the Directory. After some hesitation a meeting was brought about, under singular circumstances, and Talleyrand says 'From 'that day I never had any reason to regret making his 'acquaintance.' We think otherwise, for his connexion with Barras changed the course, if not of his opinions, at least of his life. Down to that moment the public career of Talleyrand had been open to no reproach. In the National Assembly he had been the consistent advocate of practical reforms and constitutional monarchy. He had opposed the Girondins in their desire for war, and the Jacobins in their revolutionary extravagance. He had invariably denounced the criminal passion for intervention with other nations and foreign conquests as the greatest calamity for France. He had laboured for peace under the monarchy, and when that was impossible he withdrew into exile.

The Directory, which he found established on his return,

consisted of five members, two of whom, Carnot and Barthélemy, were advocates of peace and moderation; the three others, Barras, Rewbell, and Lareveillière, were Jacobins. On principle Talleyrand belonged to the moderate party; as a matter of fact he joined the latter. By a singular turn of fortune this Directory, which was the most incapable and corrupt government ever imposed on France, was represented in the field by the greatest soldier of modern times, Napoleon Bonaparte; and in the cabinet by the most subtle and sagacious of diplomatists, Charles Maurice de Talleyrand. Both these great personages, who afterwards held in their hands the fate of Europe, owed their respective offices as general and as minister to Barras. Talleyrand was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs on July 24, 1797.

It was a moment of supreme importance to Europe. France had entered upon her career of conquests and spoliation. Italy was occupied by her armies. Preliminaries of peace had been signed at Leoben, but the negotiations for the definitive treaty of Campo Formio were going on, and in fact that agreement was dictated by the sword of Bonaparte more than by the pen of Talleyrand. Lord Malmesbury was at Lille engaged in a negotiation, in which he was aided by some of the French commissioners, and defeated by others. At the very same time the Directory was preparing General Humbert's expedition to invade Ireland. And above all the Directory itself was on the verge of another revolution.

'To give a clear conception of what I have termed the ways of the Directory, I think it will be sufficient to relate the incidents that marked the first council at which I was present. A quarrel took place between Carnot and Barras; the latter charged his colleague with having destroyed a letter which ought to have been submitted to the Directory. They were both standing. Carnot, putting up his hand, said: "I give you my word of honour that that is not so!" "Do not raise your hand," replied Barras; "blood would drip from it." Such were our rulers, and my task was to try to obtain the readmission of France to the councils of Europe, whilst such men were in power. Difficult though this great undertaking was, I did not hesitate to confront it.' (Vol. i. p. 192.)

Within a few days these dissensions broke out into open violence. The elections to the Council of Five Hundred had been in favour of the anti-revolutionary party. The Jacobin minority arrested their colleagues and transported them to Cayenne without a trial, 'by virtue of what was then termed 'a law,' on the 18th Fructidor. 'From the highest authori-

'ties to those of the lowest rank there was scarcely one that 'was not arbitrary in its formation, its composition, and 'mode of action. All this was done with violence, and as 'a natural consequence nothing could last.' Such was the government under which Talleyrand took office. The demon of power must have entered into him, for he broke at that one blow from all the principles of his former life. The circular addressed to the foreign agents of the Republic in defence of that atrocious revolution, which it ascribed to a non-existent royalist conspiracy, is a prodigious specimen of republican mendacity. Once in office, he accepted with apparent enthusiasm the policy of the Jacobins, his masters. But here again we have to depend much more on his own despatches, published by M. Pallain, than on any revelations contained in the 'Memoirs.' His own apology is in the following words:—

'It has come to my knowledge that some people, not in the days I speak of, but since the Restoration, considered that it was wrong to accept office in times of crisis and revolution, when it is impossible to work absolute good. Such judgement always appears to me most superficial. In the affairs of this world, we must not simply consider the present. *That which is*, in the majority of cases, has but a very small importance, whenever we lose sight of the fact that *that which is* produces *that which shall be*; thus indeed, as we frame the present, so will the future be shaped! If we consider matters, without prejudice and, above all, without envy, we plainly see that men do not always accept office so as to gratify their personal interests, and I might add that it is no mean sacrifice on the part of a political man to consent to being the responsible *editor* of other people's lucubrations. Selfish and timorous people are incapable of so much abnegation; but, I repeat it, it must be borne in mind that, by declining official posts, in times of upheaval, one simply affords greater facilities to the enemies of public order. He who accepts does so, not to second the advocates of a state of affairs to which he is opposed, but in order to so modify their action that it may be profitable to the future. "*En toute chose il faut considérer la fin*," said good old La Fontaine, and that is not a mere apologue.' (Vol. i. p. 191, 192.)

This reflection did not prevent Rewbell from altering his draft despatches. The tone assumed at Lille became more overbearing, and the revolution of Fructidor defeated Lord Malmesbury's negotiation. The Foreign Minister of the Directory affected to dispose of territories in Italy, Germany, and Switzerland with supreme authority; and it is characteristic that on the very day of his accession to office Talleyrand addressed a complimentary letter to Bonaparte. In fact, for the next ten years they became confederates. Talleyrand

despised and detested the Directory—or, as he called it, the Polyarchy—which he served; and he early discovered in the ambition and the genius of Bonaparte qualities which tended to the restoration of monarchy in his person. Their first meeting took place when the young general came to Paris to propose the conquest of Egypt to the Directory, and is thus described:—

'I had never seen him. At the time of my nomination to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs he had written to me, as I have already mentioned, a long letter, carefully compiled, in which he wished to appear under a different character from that which he had hitherto played on the stage of public life. This letter is sufficiently interesting to make one wish it to be inserted at the end of these *Memoirs*. [This letter is unfortunately lost.] The evening of the day on which he arrived in Paris, he sent me an aide-de-camp to ask at what hour he could see me. I replied that I awaited his leisure; he fixed the next day at eleven a.m. I informed Madame de Staël of this; she was in my drawing-room at ten o'clock. There were also some other persons whom curiosity had attracted thither. I remember that Bougainville was there. The general was announced, and I went to meet him. While crossing the room, I introduced Madame de Staël to him, but he bestowed very little attention upon her. Bougainville was the only one whom he condescended to notice, and to whom he paid a few compliments.

'At first sight, he seemed to me to have a charming face; so much do the halo of victory, fine eyes, a pale and almost consumptive look, become a young hero. We entered my study. Our first conversation was full of confidence on his part. He dwelt in kind terms on my appointment as Foreign Secretary, and insisted on the pleasure it afforded him to correspond with a person of a different stamp from that of the directors. Almost abruptly he said to me, "You are the nephew of the Archbishop of Rheims, who is with Louis XVIII." (I noticed that he did not then say with the Comte de Lille); and he added, "I *also* have an uncle who is an archdeacon in Corsica; it was he who brought me up. In Corsica, you know, an archdeacon is like a bishop in France." We soon returned to the drawing-room, which had become filled with visitors, and he said in a loud voice: "Citizens, I appreciate the attentions paid to me; I waged war as well as I could, and as well as I could made peace. It now rests with the Directory to turn the latter to the happiness and prosperity of the Republic."' (Vol. i. pp. 195–197.)

On July 18, 1798, Talleyrand presented to the Directory a memorial on the relations of France to all the other Powers of Europe, which attests his entire mastery of the subject. Our limits forbid us to dwell upon it, but there is one passage which bears remarkably on more recent events:—

'Russia without trade and without colonies is hardly assailable by any Power not coterminous with her empire. In the best days of our navy we should not have dreamed of penetrating into the Baltic and the Gulf of Finland. An expedition to Archangel would be easier, if the North Sea were not occupied by our enemies. I see, therefore, but one point on which we can touch Russia, but that point is the most sensitive. If Bonaparte establishes himself in Egypt, when he has despatched a portion of his forces against the English in India, what should prevent the French fleet entering the Black Sea in union with that of Turkey, from indemnifying that Power for the occupation of Egypt, by aiding her to reconquer the Crimea, a country much more valuable to Turkey than a province which has been abandoned for ages to the revolts of the Beys? There will not always be a strong British fleet in the Mediterranean. Attacked in India, threatened on their own coasts, struck to the heart by the progress of the insurrection in Ireland, which may disorganise their naval armaments, they will have to abandon their station at the end of the Mediterranean, and then we can march on Constantinople, where everything should be done to secure a favourable reception. The destruction of Cherson and of Sebastopol would be the just punishment of the insane hostility of Russia, and the best means of obtaining from the Turks the consolidation of our establishment in Africa.' (*Ministère sous le Directoire*, p. 247.)

Whatever may have been the intuitive spirit of conquest and adventure in the young conqueror of Italy at the age of eight-and-twenty, it is apparent from these papers that he derived from Talleyrand his knowledge of the political affairs of Europe, and even some of the schemes which fired his ambition. Perhaps the expedition to Egypt originated with the statesman more than with the general; and as the ignominious defeat of that adventure was a severe blow to their hopes, Talleyrand took advantage of a series of reverses in Italy and of the unpopularity of the Directory to resign his office exactly two years after he had accepted it. It is significant that within three months (October 9, 1799) Bonaparte returned from Egypt.

He was received with enthusiasm due to his victories, and with a presentiment of his political services. Sieyès had said, 'Il me faut une épée,' and that sword was Bonaparte. But on his arrival he was personally unknown to all the politicians of the day except Barras, and Barras was his enemy. He first met Rœderer at a dinner given by Talleyrand, and it was by the combined efforts of Talleyrand and Rœderer that he was brought into confidential relations with Sieyès, then a member of the Directory. These were the real authors of the 18th Brumaire, who placed Bonaparte on what may be termed the Consular throne. In that Revolu-

tion Talleyrand took an active, though an occult, part. He relates that 'one evening General Bonaparte called upon me 'to discuss the preliminaries of his *coup d'état.*' The conversation lasted till one in the morning, and at that hour the conspirators, for such they were, were alarmed by a noise of horses and carriages in front of the house. 'Bonaparte 'turned pale, and I quite believe I did the same. We at 'once thought that people had come to arrest us by order of 'the Directory. I blew out the candles, and went on tiptoe 'to look out.' It turned out to be a mere patrol of the police. If the Directory had known what was passing in that drawing-room, it would have changed the history of Europe. But the Directory was doomed to perish, and the 18th Brumaire raised Bonaparte to the Consulate, with Sieyès and Roger-Ducos. Talleyrand suggested, on the very first day, that as all matters connected with foreign affairs are essentially secret, they should be transacted exclusively between the First Consul and himself, as Minister of Foreign Affairs. These men thenceforward held continental Europe in their grasp, and the battle of Marengo, in June 1800, gave all power and glory to the new Government.

Sieyès and Talleyrand both took office under the First Consul, though Sieyès soon retired into private life. Thiers, who had an aversion to Talleyrand, ascribes the more important *rôle* to Sieyès, and even asserts that the outcry against Talleyrand amongst the Republicans was so loud that Bonaparte suspended his nomination for a fortnight. This statement is contradicted by the passage from the 'Memoirs' we have just cited. To Sieyès was allotted the task of framing the new Constitution, and he evolved from his inner consciousness the strange fabric of the An. VIII., which, under complicated Republican forms, paved the way to despotism. But Sieyès was a political *idéologue*—an abstract theorician, the very class of men most repugnant to Bonaparte. He was too powerful to be set aside, and his Constitution was adopted with some important changes, after which he scornfully withdrew from public affairs. Talleyrand was the exact opposite of his metaphysical contemporary. He was essentially a practical politician, and he brought to the service of the First Consul and of France precisely the qualities and the knowledge which were most requisite in the conduct of their foreign relations. Writers like M. Thiers, who ascribe everything to their idol, suppose that Bonaparte had mastered in three weeks the whole system of European politics. But it is evident from the

works before us that the foreign policy of the early Consulate was impregnated and inspired throughout with the views of Talleyrand, and to him alone we are taught to attribute the result—the more so as a time came when the impetuous will of the master broke through the precautionary measures of his sagacious minister.

We are tempted to quote a remarkable passage from the 'Eloge' of M. Reinhard, in which Talleyrand gives us his own view of the duties of a Foreign Minister:—

'Il faut qu'un ministre des affaires étrangères soit doué d'une sorte d'instinct qui l'avertissant promptement, l'empêche avant toute discussion de jamais se compromettre. Il lui faut la faculté de se montrer ouvert en restant impénétrable; d'être réservé avec les formes de l'abandon, d'être habile jusque dans le choix de ses distractions; il faut que sa conversation soit simple, variée, inattendue, toujours naturelle, et parfois naïve; en un mot il ne doit pas cesser, un moment, dans les vingt-quatre heures, d'être ministre des affaires étrangères. Cependant toutes ces qualités, quelque rares qu'elles soient, pourraient n'être pas suffisantes, si la bonne foi ne leur donnait une garantie, dont elles ont presque toujours besoin. Non, la diplomatie n'est point une science de ruse et de duplicité. Si la bonne foi est nécessaire quelque part, c'est surtout dans les transactions politiques, car c'est elle qui les rend solides et durables. On a voulu confondre la réserve avec la ruse. La bonne foi n'autorise jamais la ruse, mais elle admet la réserve; et la réserve a cela de particulier, c'est qu'elle ajoute à la confiance.'

Such was M. de Talleyrand's legacy of advice, delivered in 1838, to the profession he loved. It deserves not to be forgotten, for it comes from the hand of a master.

The first years of the Consulate restored internal order and external peace to France. The Peace of Lunéville with Austria was followed by the Peace of Amiens with England, with reference to which Talleyrand said to Bonaparte (who could not bear to hear him say it) that he would willingly have left Malta to the English, provided the Treaty had been signed by Mr. Pitt or Mr. Fox, instead of by Mr. Addington. One of his first measures was the attempt to draw Prussia into alliance with France by the mission of Duroc, a combination to which Talleyrand had always attached great importance. He powerfully contributed to the reconciliation of the French Republic with the Papal Court, and to the Concordat which restored the Church of France, a duty which the ex-Bishop of Autun had much at heart. The secularised territories in Germany were distributed under the mediation of France and Russia. The *émigrés* were allowed to return. Not a few of the Jacobins forgot their aversion to personal

rule. The spirit of the Consulate was for a time one of tolerance and moderation. If acts of violence and injustice were committed, M. de Talleyrand glides smoothly over them in this part of his work, and we may hear more about them hereafter. But as to the annexation of Piedmont and the Swiss Act of Mediation, which were especially resented by England, they were opposed by him, and he is not altogether silent on the murder of the Duc d'Enghien.

'Until the time of the Peace of Amiens, Bonaparte may have committed many faults, for what man is free from them? But none of the plans he had conceived were such that any true and patriotic Frenchman could have felt any reluctance to contribute to their execution. One may not always have agreed as to the excellence of the means resorted to by Bonaparte, but the utility of the aim could not be contested, being simply, on the one hand, to bring foreign wars to an end, and, on the other hand, to close the revolutionary era by re-establishing monarchy, which, in my candid opinion, it was then impossible to do in favour of the legitimate heirs of the last king.

'The Peace of Amiens was scarcely concluded, when Bonaparte began to give up *moderation;* the provisions of that peace had not yet been carried out, when he already sowed the seeds of new wars which, after overwhelming Europe and France, were to lead him to his ruin.

'Piedmont ought to have been given back to the King of Sardinia immediately after the Peace of Lunéville; it was merely in trust in the hands of France. To give it up would have been both an act of strict justice and a very wise policy. Bonaparte, on the contrary, annexed it to France. I made vain efforts to dissuade him from such a measure. He believed his personal interest required him to do so, his pride seemed to him to claim that arbitrary step, and all the counsels of prudence failed to alter his mind in that respect.' (Vol. i. p. 219.)

'But events quickened Bonaparte's resolution to transform the consulate for life into an hereditary monarchy. The English had landed on the coasts of Brittany a few devoted and most enterprising *émigrés.* Bonaparte took advantage of this new royalist plot, in which he flattered himself to implicate, at the same time, Dumouriez, Pichegru, and Moreau, his three rivals in glory, to wrench from the senate the title of Emperor. But that title, which, with moderation and wisdom, he would just as well have obtained, though perhaps not quite so soon, became the meed of violence and crime. He ascended the throne, but a throne besmeared with innocent blood—blood which former and glorious recollections made dear to France.

'The violent and unexplained death of Pichegru, the means used to obtain the conviction of Moreau, might be put to the account of policy; but the assassination of the Duc d'Enghien, committed solely in order, by placing himself in their ranks, to make sure of those whom the death of Louis XVI. caused to fear all manner of power not coming from them, this assassination, I say, could be neither excused nor for-

given, nor has it ever been so; Bonaparte has therefore been reduced to boast of it.' (Vol. i. pp. 220, 221.)

In the third part of this work, the author passes rapidly over the events which changed the face of Europe; but in all of them he had a considerable share. He followed Napoleon to Austerlitz, and negotiated the Treaty of Presburg with the House of Austria, and the humiliating Convention with Haugwitz, which settled the degradation of Prussia and prepared her ruin in the following year. He was present at Tilsit and at Erfurt, as we have related in a recent article. These pages add little to the well-known history of these transactions; but the intimate correspondence of the Minister and the Emperor, recently published, which we have also had occasion to review, is more explicit. It shows with what degrading servility and sycophancy Talleyrand clung to the Imperial *régime*, until he discovered that the uncontrollable ambition of the Emperor was driving the Empire to ruin. He had long known that Napoleon 'was fond of deceiving, and would do so for the 'mere love of it; apart from his policy his instinct would 'have made it a necessity for him.' To how many of these *ruses* had Talleyrand been a party? The decisive blow which led to the resignation, or rather dismissal, of the Minister, was the attack on Spain.

'The emperor had spoken to me several times of his project of seizing Spain. I opposed this plan with all my might, showing the immorality and the dangers of such an undertaking. He always alleged, as an excuse, the danger which a diversion of the Spanish government would cause him, if he should meet with any reverse on the banks of the Rhine or in Italy, and he quoted to me the unfortunate proclamation of the Prince of the Peace on the occasion of the battle of Jena. I had often refuted that objection, reminding him that it would be very unjust to hold the Spanish nation responsible for the fault of a man whom it detested and despised, and that it would be easier for him to overthrow the Prince of the Peace than to seize Spain. But he replied to me that the idea of the Prince of the Peace might be adopted by others, and that he would never be safe on the Pyrenean frontier. It was then that, driven into a corner by the artful arguments of his ambition, I proposed to him a plan which presented the guarantees of security which he was pretending to look for in Spain. I advised him to occupy Catalonia until he should obtain maritime peace with England. "You will declare," said I to him, "that you will keep that pledge until the peace, and by so doing you will hold the Spanish government in check. If peace should be deferred, it is possible that Catalonia, which is the least Spanish of all the provinces of Spain, might become attached to France; there are historical traditions for that; and perhaps it might become definitely

united with France. But anything further that you may do will one day cause you bitter regrets." I did not convince him, and he mistrusted me in this matter.

'As I have just said, he tempted the cupidity and ambition of the Prince of the Peace by a treaty relative to a dismemberment of Portugal.

'That treaty was negotiated secretly and signed on the 27th of October, 1807, at Fontainebleau, by General Duroc, and Councillor Izquierdo (confidential agent of the Prince of the Peace), unknown to M. de Champagny, Foreign Minister, and also unknown to me, although at that time I was chief Councillor of State, and was residing at Fontainebleau. (Vol. i. pp. 246 247.)

By a curious turn of events, Valençay, the residence of Talleyrand, became the abode of the entrapped Spanish princes. They were received there with the most punctilious deference, and under the courtly hospitality of the owner they enjoyed a kind of liberty they had never known near their father's throne. At Madrid, the two elder princes were not allowed to walk out without a written permission from the king. Hunting, riding, and dancing were forbidden them in Spain; they found these amusements at Valençay. The Emperor heard these things with displeasure.

'On one occasion among others, taking a bantering tone with me, rubbing his hands, and walking up and down the room, while looking at me with a mocking air, he said to me, "Well, you see what all your predictions as to the difficulties I should encounter in regulating the affairs of Spain according to my views have amounted to; I have, however, overcome these people here; they have all been caught in the nets I spread for them, and I am master of the situation in Spain, as in the rest of Europe." Provoked by this boasting, so little justified in my eyes, and above all by the shameful means he had employed to arrive at his ends, I replied to him, calmly, that I did not see things under the same aspect as he, and that I believed he had lost more than he had gained by the events at Bayonne. "What do you mean by that?" he replied. "*Mon Dieu*," I said, "it is very simple, and I will show you by an example. If a man in the world commits follies, has mistresses, conducts himself badly towards his wife, does even grave wrongs to his friends, he will doubtless be blamed; but if he is rich, powerful, and clever, he may still expect to be treated with indulgence in society. If he cheats at gaming, he is immediately banished from good company, which will never pardon him." The emperor turned pale, remained confused, and spoke to me no more on that day; but I can say that from this moment dated the rupture which, more or less marked, took place between him and me. Never after did he pronounce the name of Spain, of Valençay, or mine, without adding to it some injurious epithet which his temper furnished. The princes had not been three months at Valençay before he already believed that he saw all the vengeances of Europe proceeding therefrom. The

persons who surrounded him have often said to me that he spoke of Valençay with uneasiness, whenever his conversation or questions bore upon that place.' (Vol. i. pp. 288, 289.)

The Spanish Princes remained at Valençay five years, but in 1808 Talleyrand ceased to be a minister of Napoleon, though he retained the titular office of Vice-Grand Elector of the Empire. He retired without resentment, but not without regret, and the following passage is probably a genuine expression of his feelings:—

'Placed for so many years in the very midst of his projects, and so to say in the very *crater* of his policy, a witness to all that he did or that was done against him, there was not much credit in foreseeing that all the countries recently placed under his rule, and all the kingdoms newly created for the benefit of his family, would be the first to deal a blow at his power. Not without bitter grief, I confess, did I witness such a sight. I was fond of Napoleon; I was attached to his person, notwithstanding his faults—when he first appeared on the scene of the world, I felt attracted towards him by the irresistible spell peculiar to great genius. I was sincerely grateful to him for the favours he had bestowed on me. Besides, why should I fear to say it? I had shared in his glory, which reflected upon all those who assisted him in his noble work. Thus I can boast of having served him with devotion and, as far as I was able, with enlightened devotion. In the days when he still listened to the truth, I loyally told it to him; I told it to him even later, when it was necessary to be cautious in letting him know it; and the disfavour that my candour caused me, justified me, in my conscience, in first leaving his policy, then his person, when he had reached the point of imperilling the destinies of my country.

'When Napoleon, casting aside every reasonable transaction, threw himself, in 1812, into the fatal Russian expedition, any well-balanced mind could almost fix the date when, followed up by those powers he had humiliated, and forced to cross the Rhine again, he would lose the prestige with which fortune had hitherto surrounded him. Napoleon vanquished, was doomed to disappear from the world's stage; that is the destiny of vanquished usurpers. But France once invaded, what odds there would be against her! What means could thwart the evils which threatened her? What form of government should she adopt, if she resisted such a catastrophe? Those were serious subjects of meditation for all good Frenchmen. To consider them was a duty for those whom circumstances, or, if one prefers, their ambition, had already called, at other times, to exercise an influence on the future of their country. It is what for several years I believed I had the right to do; and according as I saw the dreadful issue approaching, I examined and combined with more care and attention the resources that would remain to us. This was neither to betray nor to conspire against Napoleon, though he had more than once charged me with doing so. I have never conspired in my life, except at those

times when I had the majority of France for an accomplice, and when I sought with her the salvation of the country. Napoleon's mistrust of and insults to me cannot change the truth of the facts, and I proclaim it loudly, he never had a dangerous conspirator against him but himself.' (Vol. ii. pp. 100, 101.)

The second volume of the 'Memoirs' now published relates, therefore, exclusively to transactions subsequent to the Prince's retirement.

It might have been foreseen that the delay of half a century and more (for these 'Memoirs' are believed to have been written in 1816) would inevitably cause them to be anticipated by other and more elaborate publications. This has been the case. One of the first important contests in which Napoleon engaged in 1809 was his struggle with the Pope. M. de Talleyrand has devoted to it one portion of his work, for he never entirely lost his interest in the affairs of the Church to which he had belonged, and the Concordat of 1801 was in great part his own creation. But the excellent history of the relations of the Pope and the Empire by the late Count d'Haussonville has long since supplied a far more authentic and complete account of the nefarious persecution of Pius VII. It was reviewed some years ago in these pages. More recently the volumes of M. Vandal and M. Tatischeff on the interviews of Tilsit and Erfurt have exhausted that subject. In 1814 M. de Talleyrand undoubtedly played a very considerable part in the restoration of the Bourbons; he presided over the Senate when all the other institutions of the Empire had crumbled into dust, and was himself, for some days, at the head of the temporary government that preceded the return of the Comte d'Artois to Paris. He naturally declined to follow the Empress to Blois; but his conduct was hesitating and pusillanimous. He was watching the course of events. Meanwhile, M. de Vitrolles was labouring with enthusiastic energy, and not without success, to direct them; and, although he was a man of far less importance than Talleyrand, we do not hesitate to say that the Vitrolles' 'Memoirs' contain a much fuller and more vivid account of the Restoration than the volumes now before us.

It fell to the lot of M. de Talleyrand to assist in the establishment of a constitutional monarchy in France, which had been the object of his earliest efforts in the Constituent Assembly. Louis XVIII. received him and treated him as a great French nobleman, whose rank was second only to his own. In that capacity Talleyrand appeared at

the Congress of Vienna, not in the character of a defeated suppliant, but as the representative of the legitimate monarch of a re-established throne. France in his person resumed her place in Europe, and that, we take it, was the proudest moment of the Prince's life. But his masterly correspondence with the King of France, from Vienna, has long been made public; and we see no reason that it should now be suffered to occupy nearly half of one of these volumes. The same may be said of the several treaties and instructions which are now republished at length. When these 'Memoirs' were written by Talleyrand, or compiled by M. de Bacourt, these official documents might be regarded as confidential papers; but they have long since entirely lost that character. Finally, the last great achievement of Talleyrand's life was the establishment of a close alliance with England in 1831, and the position assumed by the Government of King Louis Philippe in the affairs of Europe. The successful opposition of the Western to the Northern powers gave independence to Belgium and liberty to Spain. After an interval of nearly forty years the policy of Mirabeau, the policy for which Talleyrand had contended in 1792, was realised. In 1831 the time for writing Memoirs had long been passed; but here again the publication of the official correspondence of the Prince from London, and of his private letters to Madame Adélaïde, supplies all the information we require. These facts demonstrate that these 'Memoirs' add but little to the history of public events.

But, as we said at starting, they do enable us to take a more enlarged and just view of the character of the man. It is not a little significant that at this distance of time, nearly a hundred and forty years after his birth, his figure, seen through the troubled atmosphere of a century of revolutions, rises to the first rank amongst all his contemporaries, and excites a more lively interest as we recede from the period in which he lived. Self-contained, self-reliant, self-sufficient, M. de Talleyrand owed the position he created and occupied to the lofty conception he entertained of his rank, of his talents, and of his duties. He owed but little to any one; he gave more than he received. He assumed a certain *hauteur* which marked his originality and independence, whilst it rendered him absolutely indifferent to misrepresentation and even to insult. The love of power and the exercise of power were, no doubt, the leading passions of his life, but not the display of it. On the contrary, he preferred to work through others and by unseen means.

His singular penetration and knowledge of character gave him an ascendency over his contemporaries and subordinates which led them unconsciously in the direction he designed for them. The ordinary prizes of ambition were indifferent to him, because they could add nothing to the rank he already possessed; and his vanity was never touched or flattered by popular applause. No man ever lived less likely 'to wear his heart upon his sleeve for daws to peck at.' His strength lay in his silence, till at the right moment he uttered a word that acted like a spell. His witticisms are remembered not so much for their humour as for their truth. Entrenched in his own strong aristocratical personality, and retaining under all circumstances the faultless manners of the old Court of France, of which he was the last representative, he passed unchanged through all the changes of an age of revolution. But the same causes which so strongly marked his character made him a solitary man, without friends, without affections. His schoolfellow M. Choiseul-Gouffier is the only man of whom he speaks with tenderness—the man, he says, whom he most loved. An irregular youth and a discreditable marriage cut him off from domestic life, and he sank into habits of selfishness, luxury, and cupidity. That he received large sums of money from foreign powers on the occasion of several of the great transactions under the Empire is undoubted, but the integrity of statesmen in that age of plunder was low, and, although he contrived to be largely paid for his services, it is not true that he ever sold the interests of his country. But these transactions are repugnant to the nobility of character which he professed, and, in our judgement, tell largely against his fame, and accredit the belief that he was unscrupulous when his interests were concerned. His enemies, who were numerous, have not spared his reputation, and have exaggerated his defects and his offences, when they accuse him of treachery and cruelty, though he may have been an accomplice in the treacherous and cruel actions of others by consenting to serve them, and thus he has been made to bear the burden of their crimes. But it must be admitted, from the perusal of these papers, many of which bear the stamp of contemporary evidence, that he endeavoured, even in the worst times, to counteract the spirit of violence and aggression which afflicted Europe, and sought to place the liberties of France upon a secure basis under a constitutional sovereign: and he will go down to posterity as one of the most striking, if not the greatest, figures of a memorable age.

ART. II.—1. *The System of the Stars.* By AGNES M. CLERKE, Author of 'A Popular History of Astronomy during the Nineteenth Century.' London and New York: 1890.

2. *The Meteoritic Hypothesis: a Statement of the Results of a Spectroscopic Inquiry into the Origin of Cosmical Systems.* By J. NORMAN LOCKYER, F.R.S., Professor of Astronomical Physics in the Normal School of Science. London and New York: 1890.

IN the 'Republic' of Plato, Socrates maintains that the education of man, to be complete, must, in addition to gymnastic and music, embrace arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy. His simple-minded friend Glaucon readily agrees to the admission of the last into the curriculum, on the ground that the lights set in the firmament of heaven are for signs, and for seasons, and for months, and for years, whereby the husbandman knows when to sow his seed in the field, the sailor whither to steer his course on the sea, and the commander of an army when to begin and close a campaign. Socrates mockingly admits that these utilities may make the subject acceptable to the world, or, as we might put it, to the average school board. The world, he seems to imply, in its views of education is always gaping after the attainment of some practical weapon by which the comforts of life may be secured, without caring whether these comforts are accompanied by any knowledge of truth or love of righteousness. Glaucon anxiously endeavours to redeem his position and to show that he can enter into the true spirit of philosophy by remarking that, apart from any vulgar usefulness, astronomy compels the soul to look upward and leads it on from this world to another. This pious opinion had probably been expressed thousands of times before Glaucon's day, as no doubt it has been expressed thousands of times since. But Socrates treats this view as scornfully as the other. He cannot see why a man is more a philosopher for turning his eyes up than for turning them down. There is no such great difference between floor and ceiling. A man may lie on his back all day facing the sky, and yet have his soul earthbound and sensual. He must draw himself away from the visible and material objects in the sky, which are imperfect and perishable, to the problems of ideal order and beauty which are eternal.

The contemptuous opinion of mere star-gazing which Plato has put into the mouth of Socrates is justified by

almost the whole history of astrology, with its tissue of error, folly, and fraud. But Plato had also to consider that the scientific study of the stars was popularly regarded as tending to atheism. There was here the anomaly that the diligent student was thought to lose religion in that same canopy of heaven in which the superficial observer fancied himself able to find it. In a remarkable passage of 'The 'Laws,' the latest of his writings, Plato confronts this difficulty. The Athenian Stranger, the chief speaker in that dialogue, having argued that the nature of the soul and the order of the universe must lead men to believe in the gods, continues thus:—

'If a man look upon the world not lightly or foolishly, there was never any one so godless who did not experience an effect opposite to that which the many imagine. For they think that those who handle these matters by the help of astronomy, and the accompanying arts of demonstration, may become godless, because they see, as far as they can see, things happening by necessity, and not by an intelligent will accomplishing good.

'*Cleinias.* But what is the fact?

'*Athenian.* Just the opposite of the opinion which once prevailed among men, that the sun and stars are without soul. Even in those days men wondered about them, and that which is now ascertained was then conjectured by some who had a more exact knowledge of them—that if they had been things without soul, and had no mind, they could never have moved according to such exact calculations, and even at that time some ventured to hazard the conjecture that mind was the orderer of the universe. But these same persons, again mistaking the nature of the soul, which they conceived to be younger and not older than the body, once more overturned the world, or rather, I should say, themselves, for what they saw before their eyes in heaven all appeared to be full of stones and earth and many other lifeless bodies, and to these they assigned the various causes of all things. Such studies gave rise to much atheism and perplexity, and the poets took occasion to be abusive, comparing the philosophers to she-dogs uttering vain howlings, and saying other nonsense of the same sort.' *

In this ancient mirror we may see some circumstances of the modern world. Poets still occasionally find fault with philosophers, widening the gulf between science and sentiment. There are still ebbings and flowings of atheism and perplexity. To judge by the discussion of the meteoritic hypothesis, what astronomers still see before their eyes in heaven appears all to be full of stones and earth, and many lifeless bodies, and to these they assign the various causes of

* Jowett's Plato, vol. v. pp. 540, 541.

all things. We do not perhaps any longer endow the sun and stars with separate souls, or picture them 'still quir-'ing to the young-eyed cherubins,' but we retain among us the primeval conjecture that mind was the orderer of the universe. In many passages of Miss Agnes Clerke's 'System of the Stars' we may see that one who looks not lightly or foolishly on the construction of the heavens can be confirmed, not shaken, in the opinion of their Divine origin. In her preface, for example, the author says, 'Now, 'in the whole astonishing history of the human intellect, 'there is no more astonishing chapter than that concerned 'with the sidereal researches of the last quarter of a cen-'tury. Nor can the resources of thought be more effectually 'widened, or its principles be more surely ennobled through 'the vision of a Higher Wisdom, than by rendering it, so 'far as possible, intelligible to all.' Yet astonishment, it must be remembered, is essentially transient. It fades away as the marvellous becomes familiar, and those who are clearest in expounding and most zealous in extolling the wonders of nature unwillingly perhaps, but effectually, deprive them of their awe-inspiring influence upon the intelligence of mankind. When speaking of theories of creation, old and new, and of the attitude towards them of the human mind, Miss Clerke declares that 'harmony can 'only be established between its aspirations and the outer 'show of the world, and science can only become truly 'rational, when the fount of all things is reached in an 'Intelligence akin to, yet infinitely transcending, its own.' But the discoveries of the last twenty-five years, however greatly they advance our knowledge of nature, can scarcely be regarded as of theological importance. The argument is already too far advanced. If men have not been brought to believe in a supreme originating and all-sustaining Mind by what has been known for centuries of the mechanism of the universe, and the prevalence in it of imperturbable laws, neither will they be persuaded by the camera and the spectroscope. The revelations, indeed, which are due to these new engines of discovery cannot fail for the moment to make men conscious of their own ineffable insignificance in the general scheme. But that consciousness they will soon lull to sleep, and perhaps be prouder than ever before on the score of what their skill and ingenuity have discovered. When this globe of earth was considered to be the centre of the universe, for the sole sake of which all the rest existed, man, as its most important inhabitant, had some show of

reason to be vain of his position. We do not, however, find that his arrogance has been one whit diminished by the successive discoveries which have made it manifest that his dwelling-place is comparable to a little speck of cinder dust floating near one of the smaller lamps of an enormous and resplendently illumined hall, which may be itself, for all we know, only an out-of-the-way chamber in a palace of infinite dimensions.

But whether the increase of knowledge cures vanity or causes it, there is a fascination in it from which those who feel its influence never wish to escape. The volumes now under review may be safely recommended as ministering in no grudging manner to the cravings of the intellectual appetite.

Like all other branches of study, astronomy has a language of its own, of which it may be said that it facilitates work but hinders play. The requisite command of technical expressions speedily repays the time spent in acquiring it, when prolonged and thorough investigations are in question. On the other hand, the casual reader may soon be disenchanted, if he finds that he can understand nothing of an otherwise promising subject until he has been schooled in parallax and right ascension, in sines of angles and logarithms, in the precession of the equinoxes and catalogues of the stars. But even in the technical language of astronomy there are some points of general interest due to its connexion with the history of mankind. Thus, such Arabic names of stars as Aldebaran, Rigel, and Fomalhaut, such terms as zenith and azi nuth and almanac, direct our minds back to a period of many centuries in extent, a period of darkness and desolation, during which the Saracen astronomers, though doing little to advance the science, rendered no mean service by preserving it from injury and loss, so that, Dr. Whewell remarks, 'Europe might receive it 'back again when the evil days were past.' *

In a country abounding in church spires the effect of parallax must be familiar to everyone, whether they know the meaning of the Greek word itself or not. The effect must have been familiar long before church spires were invented or developed, and long before Hipparchus devised his parallactic instrument for observing it. But the word is worth the little trouble its unfamiliar form may cause us, if only as a memorial carrying us back two thousand years to this

* History of the Inductive Sciences, vol. i. p. 231.

same Hipparchus, in whom, it has been said, 'we find one 'of the most extraordinary men of antiquity; the *very* '*greatest* in the sciences which require a combination of ob-'servation with geometry,' and 'who appears to be the 'author of every great step in ancient astronomy.' The parallax or apparent displacement of an object by the alteration of the observer's position from one part of the earth to another is noticed even by children, when, as they make the circuit of a town, they say that its towers and steeples are dancing round one another. It surprises them to learn that by means of that dance the mathematician can tell how far off the objects are, without measuring the intervening distance. Those who have not studied the subject may be excused for feeling much the same surprise. The method can be indicated by a simple example. Suppose that two spires have been brought into line, so that one is exactly behind the other. There is then only a single track along which this arrangement can be maintained. Deviation to either side will separate the two objects. Suppose now that the observer, following a path at right angles to this track, finds at the end of a mile that the angle, formed by his path and the straight line which now lies between his eye and one of the spires, is an angle of sixty degrees, he will be able to determine by an easy equation that the spire is at a distance from his eye of exactly two miles. He will know also that from his first post of observation the same spire was distant a little less than a mile and three-quarters, and that the angle formed by the lines connecting the spire with his two standpoints is an angle of thirty degrees. These results follow from the relations between the sides and angles of a triangle which have been discovered and explained by Hipparchus and Euclid and their successors. What is true of small distances is equally true of great ones. Whether we take a chord of the earth's circumference, or imagine ourselves on some vast plain, if we are enabled to measure a base line between our two points of observation not only a single mile but a thousand miles long, in that case, the angles being the same, the object observed will be found at a distance of 2,000 miles from one point and something over 1,732 miles from the other. Now, if Keats could have his breath taken away on first reading Homer in Chapman's massive verse, if Cortez or Balbóa could be struck dumb with the first view of the Pacific, what must have been the thrill of amazement, the breathless exultation, in that man's heart who first perceived the magical potency of parallax!

For if one can ascertain the distance of an object two miles away or two thousand miles away without traversing the intermediate space, why should not a distance of two thousand times two thousand miles be equally within the compass of our measurement? The idea that man would ever be able to calculate the interval that separates this globe from any of the other orbs in the sky might well have seemed a fancy too wild even for a dream, until the calculation became an accomplished fact.

But simple as the principle is, those who read Miss Clerke's book or other works on astronomy will soon find that the reckonings are often attended with enormous difficulties in practice. When the base line is large compared with the remoteness of the object, and consequently the angle subtended is large, as in the example given, the result is easily and securely obtained. It is not quite the same when the denizens of earth have to find a suitable base line from which to measure celestial distances. Our example dealt with an angle of thirty degrees. Since each degree contains sixty minutes, and each minute sixty seconds, in thirty degrees there are 108,000 seconds. Now the sun's parallax, with the radius or semidiameter of the earth for base, is only about eight seconds and a half. The radius of the earth bears the same proportion to the sun's distance from the earth's centre, as those few seconds bear to the number of seconds in an arc equal to the radius, this latter number being 206,265. A difference of less than half a second in the parallax makes a difference of more than three millions of miles in the estimate of the sun's distance. For, to take only round numbers, if we regard the semidiameter of the earth as 4,000 miles long, multiplying by 200,000 (for the seconds of arc) and dividing by 9 (for seconds of parallax), we find a distance for the sun of less than ninety millions of miles, whereas, if we divide by eight, the distance will be one hundred millions. There is, moreover, the refraction of the atmosphere to be reckoned with, which is sufficient to upset the whole calculation. Fortunately, direct observation of the solar parallax has been assisted by other methods, and it will suffice for our present purpose to consider that the radius of the earth's orbit round the sun is about ninety-three millions of miles, the orbit itself being about six times as many.

The reader who happens to be disdainful of geometry and mathematics in general may have been appalled at the outset by the mention of a base line a mile long. We have

now arrived at a base line more than ninety millions of miles in length, and are not without hope that the reader who has struggled through the troublesome preliminary details may in consequence be in a position to appreciate what is told him in the following extract from Miss Clerke's volume :—

'Let us consider for a moment what must be the visual effect upon very distant objects of the comprehensive and unceasing rounds of the planet upon which we are borne as spectators. Unmistakeably, to begin with, we see them in different directions at different times of year. In January and July, in March and September, and so on, we are at opposite ends of base lines 186 millions of miles in length. The stars, then, must be continually thrown now a little to one side, now to the other, of the true or "mean" places which they would severally occupy if viewed from the immobile sun. In other words, each describes round its mean place in a period of a year a small apparent orbit, which is nothing else than the orbit of the earth projected in miniature on the sky. For stars situated in the ecliptic—that is, in the plane of the earth's travelling—this orbit contracts into a right line, along which the star merely swings to and fro; for stars near the pole of the ecliptic, the perspective orbit is virtually a circle; while intermediate latitudes afford all degrees of foreshortening. Every star—unless those few lying close to the pole of the ecliptic—has thus its epochs of maximum parallax, six months apart, when it seems to stand alternately at opposite extremities of the major axis of the parallactic ellipse, and it is then that measures of its apparent displacements can be most advantageously made. These opportune seasons occur when the earth's longitude falls short of or exceeds by ninety degrees the longitude of the star. They are exceedingly different for stars with different longitudes.

'The precise *form* of displacement due to the earth's revolution round the sun is thus strictly calculable for each individual star; the *amount* alone cannot be predicted, but must be obtained by observation; and from this amount the distance of the star is deduced. For each parallactic orbit is a perfect model, both in shape and size, of the earth's orbit as it would be seen from the star, abridgement of compass (down to contraction into a virtual point) corresponding to a more and more profound immersion in the abysses of space.

'The parallax of a star is, then, the difference between its positions as seen from either side, and from the centre of the earth's orbit. It is, in short, the angle subtended, at the distance of that particular star, by the mean interval between earth and sun. Now we can tell in a moment how far off a spectator must be to see a line ninety-three millions of miles in length diminished to the angular dimension of, let us say, one second. He must be 206,265 × 93 millions of miles distant. But no star has yet been found so *near* to us as this.'

Such calculations, to be trustworthy, depend upon exquisitely refined measurements. Miss Clerke explains the

almost heartbreaking difficulties which have thwarted astronomers down to the present period—a period of such vigilant sagacity that she can say of some of her distinguished contemporaries that 'their anxious and elaborate inquiries 'regard not merely microscopic inequalities of scale divisions 'and screw values, changes in refraction, corrections for 'aberration and proper motion, but the very tricks of their 'own nerves, the caprices of cerebration, all the varying 'conditions of perception in the organism at their individual 'command.' All these things being allowed for, the nearest neighbour star to our own sun, so far as at present known, is Alpha Centauri, with a parallax of three-quarters of a second, implying that its distance from us is twenty-five millions of millions of miles, an interval which a train travelling continuously at twenty-eight miles an hour would not finish traversing in a hundred million years.

Light, which comes to us from the sun in eight minutes, must take four years and four months to come from Alpha Centauri. The star Canopus, the chief luminary of the great constellation Argo, shows no parallactic shifting, from which it is inferred, under certain reserves, that it must be at such a distance that its light needs *at least* sixty-five years to reach us. It is in that case at least fifteen times as far away as Alpha Centauri. When such distances are rendered into miles the unwieldy numbers overpower our imagination, and seem to require the development of a special arithmetical sense, or of some special faculty, like an ear for music, before the mind will give them admittance or bid them welcome. The vastness of the space concerned may be, as it were, brought home to us by an indirect method. Canopus is a star of the first magnitude as seen from our standpoint, but our midget of a sun as seen from Canopus would only show as a star between the seventh and eighth magnitudes, so that it would require the light of 2,500 such suns as ours to equal the light of one Canopus.

That some stars are bigger than others is one of the conclusions that the most ignorant person might jump at. If pushed to give a reason for the belief, such a person would probably have recourse to the evident differences in brightness which many stars exhibit. But, so far as that is concerned, all the stars might be equal in size, though at various stages of remoteness; the light, according to a well-known law, decreasing with the increase of the square of the distance. In point of fact, the stars are enormously unequal. The term *magnitude*, however, 'has nothing to

'do with apparent size, but refers entirely to apparent lustre, 'which depends upon distance and intensity of shining, as 'well as upon real dimensions.' The so-called 'magnitudes' form an arbitrary though exceedingly useful scale, determined in modern times as follows: The average of brilliance in the twenty brightest stars is accepted as that of the first magnitude, which is numbered 1, while the next higher magnitude is 0, the next −1, and so on, the stars above the brightness of the first magnitude being, of course, extremely few. The light ratio, or proportion of change from one magnitude to the next, has been fixed at the numerical value 2·512, this precise number having been chosen for a special facility which it affords in calculation. It means that an average star of the first magnitude sends us rather more than two and a half times as much light as an average star of the second magnitude, and so on with each magnitude in regard to the next below it. Hence it can be reckoned that a first magnitude star gives as much light as a whole hundred stars of the sixth, or as much as a million stars of the sixteenth, magnitude. Nevertheless, 'each class of stars sends us appreciably more light than 'the class next above it. The light aggregate of second 'magnitude stars exceeds that of first, of third that of 'second, and so on. The fainter the stars, in short, the 'greater is their total luminous power, because their aug-'mented numbers more than counterbalance their diminished '*individual* lustre.' Miss Clerke argues that this progression cannot go on for ever, since otherwise the sky would be filled with radiance, and darkness abolished through the shining of invisible stars. She concludes, therefore, that the star depths, however profound, are not absolutely unfathomable. Having set forth this view at the outset of her work, she returns to it with still more emphasis at the close:—

'But the probability amounts almost to certainty that star-strewn space is of measureable dimensions. For from innumerable stars a limitless sum total of radiations should be derived, by which darkness would be banished from our skies; and the "intense inane," glowing with the mingled beams of suns individually indistinguishable, would bewilder our feeble senses with its monotonous splendour. This laying bare, so to speak, of the empyrean would be the simple and certain result of the continuance *ad infinitum* of any arrangement of sidereal objects comparable with that prevailing in our neighbourhood. Unless, that is to say, light suffer some degree of enfeeblement in space. If this be the case, then our reasonings are put to silence, and a veil is drawn impenetrable to scrutiny. But there is not a particle of evidence

that any such toll is exacted; contrary indications are strong, and the assertion that its payment is inevitable depends upon analogies which may be wholly visionary. We are then, for the present, entitled to disregard the problematical effect of a more than dubious cause. The sidereal system cannot accordingly be regarded as in any true sense infinite.'

However many millions of stars the great Lick refractor, or any future improvement upon it, may make visible to our eyes, and however many invisible millions in addition the sensitiveness of the photographic plate may put on record, the human mind does not appear to have been yet invented which can grapple either with the idea of a finite universe or with that of an infinite one. The sidereal system would not be proved to be infinite, even if the whole visible sphere of the heavens were actually occupied by a blaze of unbroken starlight. But neither is it proved to be finite by the defect of such radiance. Without appealing to any unproved enfeeblement of light in its course through space, we may refer to the known circumstance that there are opaque bodies in our sidereal system, and to the strong probability that, as time goes on, there will be many more than there are at present. There is at least a possibility, therefore, that the universe may contain many vast regions of brightness, separated from one another, as it were, by walls and fences of worlds no longer radiant, or by zones of cloud impervious to light.

Meanwhile there is almost enough to fill the thoughts of such a creature as man in the penetrable regions of the sky. In early days, even to his unaided eyesight, the hosts of heaven were a type of countless multitudes. But where the keenest sighted astronomer of old might have distinguished ten thousand stars in the portion of the sphere open to his gaze, his successor with a modern telescope only two inches and a half across can register three hundred thousand. For the whole celestial sphere an index of stars, all of them above the tenth magnitude, is expected to contain when completed no less a number than six hundred and fifty thousand. In the great Californian telescope, the Lick refractor of thirty-six inches, which increases for us the apparent brightness of a star thirty-two thousand four hundred times, the number of the heavenly bodies that are visible rises, as already hinted, from hundreds of thousands to millions. Again, beyond these powers of telescope-aided sight, the plates of the photographer take up the tale of the indefinitely vast and varied census. As a savage by the cumulative effect of

continuous pressure, without any sudden violence, forces a flake from the stubborn flint, so, it appears, impressions of light too faint to be of any avail for human vision may be massed together to act upon silver bromide. In the clear-obscure of night, the patient astronomer, exercising his utmost vigilance, perhaps for hours together, to see that the equatorial telescope shall exactly follow the movement of the star-sprinkled sphere, obtains a wondrous record. The light of a world so distant that the most powerful instrument will not show it to the astronomer's own eye, prints itself on the photographic plate. Scarcely in any philosophy could such a result have been dreamed of, until, while poring over their nature-printed charts of the sky, the astronomers found mysterious strangers among the old familiar faces, and it dawned upon them that they were looking upon the signatures of invisible worlds.

Side by side with this strange contradiction of our being in a way able to see what cannot be seen, may be placed the other contradiction that we never see what we seem to see. For, as the light of one star may take five years and that of another fifty years to reach us—unless they are both relatively stationary—the story which the more distant one tries to tell us about its position in relation to the nearer one will always be forty-five years out of date.

The ancients, it appears, gave the name 'planets,' or *wanderers*, to Jupiter and Venus and their companions in our system, not so much because they moved as because to all appearance their movements were irregular. The fixed or fastened stars, on the other hand, were so called because of their seeming to keep relatively to one another ever the same positions. There are some constellations or groups of these fixed stars which in their most striking features are familiar to almost every one. Such are the Great Bear with its seven *shiners*,* Orion with his belt, the little Pleiades

* Professor Max Muller says, or at least some years ago he said: '*Riksha*, in the sense of bright, has become the name of the bear, so called either from his bright eyes or from his brilliant tawny fur. The same name *ṛiksha* was given in Sanskrit to the stars, the bright ones.' By the Vedic poets it was applied 'more particularly to that constellation which, in the northern parts of India, was the most prominent. The etymological meaning of *ṛiksha*, as simply the bright stars, was forgotten. The popular meaning of *ṛiksha*, bear, was known to everybody. And thus it happened that when the Greeks had left their central home and settled in Europe, they retained the name of *arktos* for the same unchanging stars; but not knowing why these stars had

mourning their lost sister. Men who have noticed these in childhood grow old without remarking or suspecting any change of arrangement in the components of these conspicuous groups. And yet they *do* move. There is indeed nothing in nature that is not in constant motion. Science declares that the molecules of the stately column and the ponderous girder are in a condition of continual agitation; the masses of mountain glaciers and frozen seas never stand still, and with these the solid globe and all the galaxy of heaven combine to establish the ancient dictum of Heracleitus, that nothing is ever in one stay. But, apart from any *à priori* opinion or any reasoning from analogy, the unfixing of the stars rests upon proofs available now, though inaccessible to the ancients. It is only within the modern period that instruments and methods of precision have made it possible to plot out the places of the stars with such exactness that, by comparison of the charts of one generation with those of another, differences in the positions can be ascertained in a trustworthy manner. Castor, in the constellation Gemini, is a binary star. Though single to the unassisted eye, by the telescope it is seen to consist of two stars in orbital motion, a little more than five seconds apart. Their relative situation was recorded by Bradley in 1719. Measures of the present day show that they have shifted their position in the interval to the extent of a little more than a third of a revolution. Alpha Centauri is a binary star which exhibits another kind of change, in that its components have changed their colour since they were observed by Sir John Herschel. Numbers not only of binary but of triple and multiple stars are known. It may expand, if needful, our conception of the immensity of the sidereal universe to reflect that in such cases the two or more companion stars, wheeling round a common centre of gravity, and producing upon our eyes the impression of a single stationary light, must often be even thousands of millions of miles apart, and requiring hundreds of years of rapid flight to complete a single orbital circuit. In dealing with these movements, photography is beginning to give highly im-

originally received that name, they ceased to speak of them as *arktoi* or many bears, and spoke of them as the Bear, the Great Bear.' (Lectures on the Science of Language, 2nd series, pp. 361, 362.) This ingenious explanation would be less open to suspicion if the menagery of the sky contained only bears, instead of comprising a miscellaneous collection to which rams, goats, bulls, lions, snakes, and fishes contribute.

portant assistance. Remarkable, also, is the bearing upon them of spectroscopic observation. The orbits in question being inclined at all sorts of angles to our eyes, some, as might be expected, are presented to us, not square and full, but edgewise. But while a star is approaching or receding directly in the line of sight, it cannot show any change of position, and it is too far off for its advance and retreat to produce any appreciable increase and decrease in its apparent size. It is precisely in this difficulty, in which our eyes seem helpless, that the refrangibility of light comes to the rescue. In the spectrum of a star minute displacements of known lines are produced towards the blue end by the motion of approach, and towards the red by that of recession. 'The refrangibility of the luminous beams is changed, 'in the one case, by the crowding together of the ethereal 'vibrations, rendering them more numerous in a given time; 'in the other, by their being (as it were) drawn asunder, and 'so rendered less numerous.' Moreover, these spectroscopic motion displacements are proportional to the velocity of the star; they can be measured; they are absolutely independent of distance; and it is argued that they may be eventually utilised to determine stellar parallaxes so minute as to be otherwise insensible.

So long as the motions observed affect the components, relatively to one another, of a binary, triple, or multiple star, which the naked eye beholds as a single lamp, we might be inclined to regard these luminaries as practically fixed after all. They might be compared to a chandelier carrying numerous lights and rotating on its own axis, though always pendent from exactly the same point of the ceiling. But the inquiry has been carried further. The Pleiades are visibly a group. Throughout ancient history they were represented as seven stars, wanting one. In our own day that small square of sky space over which this cluster of half a dozen is scattered has been found to be occupied by many more than two thousand suns. The distance of the group from us is estimated as at least fifteen hundreds of millions of millions of miles, and it is calculated that Alcyone, the chief of its stars, must a thousand times excel our own sun in brilliance. Now, in regard to this goodly company there is evidence that the majority have an apparent motion in common. But that which is true of most of this wonderful crowd of worlds is not true of all the individuals that at first sight seem to belong to it. A few are found to lag behind, while two at least hurry on in advance of the general progress.

These sets, then, do not in fact belong to the cluster, but, being situated far beyond or far in front, take their places in the same apparent plane only through the effect of perspective. The question may naturally be asked, What can produce this appearance of motion either in the stars of the group or in the stars before and behind it? It must be produced by reality of motion somewhere, either on the part of the stars themselves or else of another star, the sun with which we are ourselves identified, or else on the part of both combined. It is obvious that, if our solar system is in motion, the other solar systems of the sky are likely to be in motion also, and *vice versâ*. Thus we might expect that the apparent movements referred to would be a mixed result, and this is found to be the case. The displacements of the stars are analysed into what is called 'the *motus parallacticus*, 'optically transferred to the whole stellar multitude from 'the single real motion of the sun; and the *motus peculiaris*, 'belonging to each individual star.' Slowly, as slowness is counted in celestial things, our sun is moving towards such and such a point in the heavens. This inference is drawn from the fact that thousands of variously situated stars are found to have a drift in the opposite direction. But this drift does not account for the whole of their movements, and when that part of the movement which is common to all has been subtracted, the residuum, in whatever direction it may happen to be for each, is set to the account of the star's own progression.

Having now widened our vision to some glimmering comprehension of the space, the ungrudging if incalculable distances, with which modern astronomy concerns itself, and having glanced at the glory and unstinted multitudes of the celestial orbs within that space, and, further, having noted that all these orbs are beyond any reasonable doubt instinct with wondrous motion, we may well be inclined to ask, not who made all these things, nor yet why they were made, but whether anything can be ascertained as to how they were made. An old Greek writer explains the fable of Pegasus by saying that his rider, Bellerophon, was a man who went up to heaven, not on a winged horse, but on the wings of the intellect, and, similarly, he says that the young man Icarus did not fall into the water through the melting of his waxen pinions, but that he was one who explored things too deep for him and was drowned in the sea of his own presumption. Though the successful Bellerophon obtains the meed of renown, some pity may rightly be felt

for Icarus, since it is probably stumblings and failures that have made up a large part of human progress, wrong guesses and futile experiments that have laid the foundations of a large part of human knowledge. In the testing of hypotheses a true theory is often at last brought to light and established. The theory of gravitation was at first only an hypothesis. Because it explained some, it did not follow that it would explain all, of the facts to which it was applicable. But it has been so steadily grappling with the problems successively confronted with it, that it is now regarded as a law of nature to which no seeming contradictions can be lastingly opposed. We feel sure that it bears sway over the remotest sun as completely as over the pebble that falls from our own fingers. The visible universe ceases to be an inextricable maze, an unwieldy and monstrous machine, even to our limited ideas, when we perceive that it can be controlled by a regulation so magnificently simple. There is in this at least one bond of sympathy between all the parts of the mighty whole, and it carries the suggestion of a chance, of a likelihood, that there may be others. The analogies of birth and life and death among ourselves, of the upheaval of mountains to be worn down again by frosts and rains and rivers, of the continual interchange by which inorganic substances are transmuted into plants, these into animals, and the animal structures back into the inorganic condition, produce a readiness of belief that the same general plan may prevail everywhere—that while some worlds are being born, others are in their prime, others in the stages of decay, and that thus not to man only, but to the mighty Arcturus or to any other resplendent orb, may be applied the maxim, 'Dust 'thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.'

Given a shooting star, from it to construct the fabric of the heavens—may strike some minds as being a merely humorous problem, as though one were desired to balance one of the Pyramids on its apex, or from the colour of the captain's hair to discover the height of the mainmast of a ship. Nevertheless, it is this problem of the shooting star that is now before the scientific world. It so happens that the objects called shooting or falling stars, instead of being invariably burnt up in the higher regions of the atmosphere, sometimes fall to the ground, and can be picked up and subjected to experiment. American law treats them as a sort of fearful wildfowl—objects *feræ naturæ*—which, if they fall by the wayside, do not belong to the finder but to the owner of the adjacent ground. The astronomer regards them

neither as a species of game nor yet as landed property, but as a possible key to open the mysteries of the surrounding universe. He speaks of them as meteorites, and divides them into *irons* and *stones* according to their structure. It is reckoned, as a daily average for the globe at large, that twenty millions of such bodies (of a size to be visible under ignition in a clear dark night) make their way into the air. When they encounter it, the friction generated by the speed at which they travel produces a conflagration. Those that survive this fiery ordeal and reach the ground will be the feeble remnants of far larger bodies. Their crust bears witness to the heat endured and to the suddenness of its operation. At certain parts of the year their trains of light are seen with greater frequency than at others, and, as is now well known, these annual periods of frequency mark the steps of larger periods by which the most brilliant displays are separated in time from one another. This piece of knowledge has resulted from a process colloquially described as putting two and two together. There was a great star shower in the year 1799. Humboldt beheld it from Cumana, in South America. The Cumanese informed him that they had witnessed a similar display in 1766. In 1833 various eminent observers beheld and studied the like phenomenon, and in 1866 these natural fireworks were advertised in advance to the general public, and admired by expectant throngs. These dates, which concern what are at present and for the present called the November meteors, speak clearly for a periodicity of about thirty-three years, and accordingly, in searching back through ancient annals, it has been found that the casual notices of great star showers assign them to dates separated by multiples of this number. The showers themselves, then, are not casual, but regular, and their occurrence has been shown to be due to the passage of our earth through a meteoric swarm which moves round the sun in an orbit inclined at a not very large angle to the plane of the earth's own orbit. Once in every 33 years, it is calculated, the centre of the group is brought into contact with the earth, while on three other occasions in this interval the earth passes very near its centre.

Besides the November shower there are many other meteor swarms well known to astronomers, and there are also those meteors which have been provisionally called *sporadic*. In regard to these, Mr. Norman Lockyer says :—

'Suppose that all the regions of space swept through by the earth in its orbit round the sun were occupied here and there by meteorites

moving like the earth in orbits round the sun, and let us assume for the moment that they are pretty nearly equally distributed, and are moving in all directions.

'Under these circumstances the earth in movement in its orbit, at the rate of about 1,000 miles a minute, would be sweeping through them all the year round, and we should get the appearance of a shooting star or the fall of a meteorite every day in the year. Careful observations in climates most convenient for these researches, where the sky is freest from cloud and is purest, show, as we have seen, that *there is not only no night but no hour without a falling star.* We are, therefore, justified in considering that practically the part of the solar system which is swept through by the earth is not a vacuum, not empty space, but space occupied by meteorites here and there.'

A French author acutely observed that these sporadic meteors were more numerous near sunrise than near sunset, and from this connexion with terrestrial hours argued that the meteors must have a terrestrial not a cosmical origin. But other astronomers presently showed that these varying numbers did not contradict the latter alternative. On the contrary, they were demanded by it. A uniform distribution of the meteors in surrounding space, combined with the known direction and amount of the earth's motion, would have this result. There will be more light-producing collisions seen when the observer in the early morning is looking forward in the direction of the earth's onward course, than when in the evening he is looking back upon the path already traversed.

In this state of the evidence one might be inclined to regard the meteors as tiny planets careering round the sun in various orbits. Schiaparelli and Oppolzer, however, made them out to be not so much planetoids as *cometoids*, by connecting the orbit of the comet of 1862 with the August star shower. Soon afterwards Oppolzer showed that the comet of 1866 was a part of the November meteor swarm, and in 1867 Leverrier announced the result of a remarkable calculation, indicating that this group owed its existence as a member of our system to the attraction of the distant planet Uranus, and that the effect had been produced since the commencement of the Christian era. He found that the year 126 would give a position to the planet Uranus capable of converting the parabolic path of a comet into the path now described by the meteors in question. In A.D. 137 this changed path for the first time came near the earth in her orbit round the sun, and between that date and 1866 the comet or swarm of meteoric stones has completed fifty-two entire revolutions. In the year 472 their tenth revolution

showed the sky at Constantinople 'on fire with flying 'meteors;' in A.D. 902 their twenty-third revolution spread falling stars 'over the face of the sky like rain,' so that from one night's display that year was called the 'Year of 'Stars.' In A.D. 1202, on the occasion of their thirty-second return, 'the stars appeared like waves upon the sky, towards 'the east and west; they flew about like grasshoppers, and 'were dispersed from left to right.'* In concluding an account of the theory of shooting stars, Dr. Haughton declares that 'it is not unlikely that the whole of inter-'planetary space is, more or less, filled with paving stones 'revolving in orbits round planets, sun, or even other 'cometary bodies; and that streams of such stones, com-'pelled by mechanical forces to follow similar paths, cause 'all the periodic phenomena already described as charac-'teristic of periodic shooting stars, whenever they happen to 'intersect the atmosphere of the earth.' Humboldt, when discussing the difficulties felt in his day in regard to luminous meteors, intimates that he himself and a few contemporary philosophers were inclined to favour the theory which has since been generally adopted, for he says: 'These difficulties would in great part be removed if the 'direction of the movement of falling stars allowed us to 'consider them as bodies with a solid nucleus, as cosmic 'phenomena (belonging to space beyond the limits of our 'atmosphere), and not as telluric phenomena (belonging to 'our planet only).'†

If, then, the meteoric stones in our museums are on astronomical grounds to be considered comets that have fallen into captivity, it is not unnatural to ask whether the view can be corroborated by spectrum analysis. To this investigation Professor Norman Lockyer has devoted himself with untiring energy and zeal. He compares the spectra of the meteorites at high and low temperatures with the spectra of their known components, with the spectrum of the aurora, with the spectra of comets at different parts of their orbits in which vast differences of temperature are developed. By this line of inquiry he establishes, in various chapters of his work, 'the identity of origin of luminous 'meteors and falling stars with meteorites;' that the aurora is 'a phenomenon produced by the dust of meteors

* Manual of Astronomy, by the Rev. Samuel Haughton, pp. 204, 205; The Meteoritic Hypothesis, pp. 119, 120.

† Personal Narrative, translated by T. Ross, vol. i. p. 358.

'and falling stars;' and that comets and meteor swarms may be regarded as interchangeable terms. One item of the investigation may be given as an illustration of its general character. 'Since iron exists in great quantity in meteorites, its signature was naturally the first thing to be expected in the spectrum of the aurora, supposing that to be truly a meteoritic phenomenon. Consequently in the early days of the meteoritic dust theory spectroscopists, misled by this expectation, 'lost sight of the importance of considering the 'volatility of the meteoritic constituents, instead of their 'quantities,' whereas now Professor Lockyer's 'experiments 'on the luminous phenomena seen at low temperatures show 'that if magnesium, manganese, and lead are present in 'meteorites, they will be indicated in the spectrum before 'the iron.'

That our own insignificant solar system should have its spaces more or less full of whirling dust and 'paving stones' may seem a conception not so very difficult to admit, especially as the constituents of these showers or swarms are supposed to be, as a rule, scores of miles apart from one another; but the theory once started launches out into the unfathomable, or at any rate unfathomed, ocean of the stars, and seeks to embrace them all. The thought is not wholly new. Many minds have been employed upon it, and that for many years. Mr. Lockyer, in the very interesting historical portions of his work, disarms jealousy by his frank recognition, both as to the past and the present, of what other workers have done in his own especial field. He quotes, among other things, the results at which Schiaparelli had arrived more than twenty years ago, as the basis of his own view. Schiaparelli considers that 'matter is disseminated in celestial 'space in all possible grades of division:' the first grade consisting of large stars, isolated or in small companies; the second of large agglomerations of small stars, the *star dust* of Herschel; the third of comets; the fourth of cosmical clouds, composed of very minute elements. This last class of bodies, he considers, 'may have been formed in space by 'the local concentration of the celestial matter, in a manner 'analogous to the crystallisation of substances chemically 'dissolved in liquids.' Then, after discussing the movements of cosmical clouds, with the probable origin and results of such movements, and the identity of falling stars with meteorites, he concludes that, 'as in such matter there 'is no chemical element that is not found upon the earth, 'the similarity of composition of all the visible bodies in

'the universe, already rendered probable by researches 'with the spectroscope, acquires a new argument for its 'credibility.'

Towards this theory, as expanded by Professor Norman Lockyer, Miss Clerke maintains an attitude of some reserve, though acknowledging that in part, at least, it 'well deserves 'thinking about.' Her account of it is worth citing:—

'The general conclusions arrived at may be thus summarised. All self-luminous bodies in space are composed of meteorites variously aggregated, and at various stages of temperature depending upon the frequency and violence of their mutual collisions. Comets, nebulæ, gaseous stars, and stars showing banded spectra of the third type, are veritable meteor swarms—they are made up, that is to say, of an indefinite multitude of separate and, in a sense, independent solid bodies, bathed in evolved gases, and glowing with the heat due to their arrested motions. Their component meteorites, however, eventually become completely vaporised when stars of the solar and Sirian types are produced. These—the only true "suns"—owe their high temperatures to the surrendered velocities of the original myriads of jostling particles drawn together to constitute them by the victorious power of gravity.

'To the meteor swarms thus serving as the basis of stellar transformations a collective origin and a collective history are necessarily attributed. The theory before us postulates a "curdling process," by which, from some unimaginably subtle kind of matter, an "infinitely fine" metallic dust is formed, and this infinitely fine dust "becomes at last, in the celestial spaces, agglomerated into meteoritic irons and stones." The "eddying" of these round self-constituted centres gives the meteor swarms supposed to represent the protoplasm of stars.' *

But Miss Clerke considers, for her own part, that, judging by the structure of available meteorites, a strong presump-

* As to stars of the third type mentioned in the above quotation, Miss Clerke elsewhere says of them: 'We find that all are more or less red, that the light of all is powerfully absorbed, and that all exhibit highly complex spectra comprising superposed orders of effects undeniably due to very different stages of temperature.' Betelgeux, otherwise called α Orionis, a star of the first magnitude, is an example of this type. Mr. Lockyer says: 'The law of parsimony compels us to ascribe the bright fluting of carbon in these "stars" to the same cause as that at work in comets, where we know it is produced by the vapours between the individual meteorites or repelled from them. Hence we are led to conclude that the absorption phenomena are produced by incandescent vapour surrounding individual meteorites which have been rendered intensely hot by collisions, while the carbon light comes from the interspaces.' Upon this view there is a lively controversy.

tion arises that they are either *débris* or ejecta, and were *not* separately formed in space. In regard to apparent spectroscopic coincidences, by which Mr. Lockyer would connect meteoric chips in the laboratory with the nebulæ and stars of the distant heaven, Miss Clerke observes that the coincidences, being only approximate, cannot count as demonstrations. But, nevertheless, she admits that meteorites 'doubtless form a link in the cosmical chain, and are united 'by relations of great consequence with larger cosmical 'masses.' Also she believes in 'the fundamental unity 'underlying (there is reason to suppose) the chemistry of 'all the celestial species,' so that of the two or three dozen terrestrial elements that occur in meteorites, many, if not all, will certainly be 'in one way or another universally 'diffused in nature.' Further, she fully accepts the conclusion at which Sir William Herschel arrived in the early part of the century, that stars are generated from nebulæ. On this point telescopic evidence is ratified by the spectroscope:—

'In quality of light, as well as in general aspect, distinctions between stars and nebulæ are shaded off by numerous minute gradations. There is no real breach of continuity anywhere. The line spectra of one division of nebulæ include continuous radiance; the continuous spectra of the other division possibly include bright lines. Gaseous stars take their rise almost insensibly from planetary nebulæ, and themselves merge into unmistakeable suns. That the great nebulæ are the parent forms of stellar clusters is rendered highly probable by their common possession of luminous as well as structural peculiarities; nor can any definitive separation between them be established. The trapezium stars in Orion, like crystals embedded in their rocky matrix, are still thickly folded in the generating cosmical stuff. By Dr. Huggins's photograph they may be said to be "caught in the act" of completing their transformation, a partial survival of the original community of gaseous nature being made apparent through their self-recorded bright lines.'

But to admit that suns must be generated, gradually reach their prime of radiance, and by degrees become extinguished, is one thing. It is quite another to agree with Professor Norman Lockyer's explanation of the manner in which all this comes about, or with his classification of the stars according to these several stages. Here are delicate niceties of belief concerned, in which it seems that the high priests of the spectroscopic cult are themselves not in exact accord. It would ill become the laity to interfere. It is the less needful, since on every disputed point the most highly trained skill and the most zealous perseverance are being

concentrated by observers in various parts of the world, while the camera with its 'retina that never tires' is giving to the revelations both of the telescope and the spectroscope a precision that cannot be gainsaid. For the future clearing up of doubts there is large hope. For the present state of the controversy the two volumes under review should be carefully studied, as well as for much else that apart from all dispute is teeming with interest.

As to the special points on which the conclusions of the two volumes differ, both presuppose in the reader an admission of the general results at which spectrum analysis has arrived. They alike recognise, as might be supposed, that solid and liquid bodies when incandescent give a continuous spectrum, while the chemical elements in a state of incandescent gas or vapour have line spectra; that, as apparently no two sets of substances give the same sets of lines, the existence of a substance may be inferred from the occurrence of its lines in the spectrum; that bright lines imply that the light is radiated from the vapours themselves, whereas dark lines imply that the vapours are absorbing the rays of a brighter light behind them. They agree in fact on all the general principles, but differ as to the interpretation of some of the observed facts. Considering the extreme difficulty of the research as applied to the far-off heavens, the comparative novelty of its methods, and the many complications presented by the subject-matter, such differences of interpretation are little to be wondered at. To take a significant example: Professor Lockyer lays great stress on the identification of the chief nebula line with the low-temperature magnesium fluting near $\lambda$ 500. The twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth chapters of his volume are devoted to explaining as well the arguments in favour of this view as the elaborate experiments conducted by himself and several scientific assistants in order thoroughly to test it. He expresses his opinion that the facts recorded in the two chapters seem to demonstrate conclusively that the line under discussion is due, as the induction suggested, to magnesium. The observations have left, he says, no doubt in his mind as to the coincidence of the chief nebula line with the magnesium fluting, under such conditions that at the same time coincidence of the F line of hydrogen with the third nebula line was demonstrated. He enters by implication a sort of *caveat* in regard to the possible errors and prejudices of other observers. In contrast with his confidence in the results obtained may be set a notice which

appeared in the 'Athenæum' of March 23 of the present year.

'Mr. Keeler,' it is there said, 'gives the results of his recent observations of the spectrum of the great nebula in Orion at the Lick Observatory. He has succeeded in fixing with great accuracy the true position of the chief nebular line, and given the *coup de grâce* to Professor Lockyer's theory of its coincidence with the magnesium fluting, very grave doubts with respect to which had, it will be remembered, been thrown by the observations of Dr. and Mrs. Huggins at Tulse Hill.'

As Dr. Huggins is to be President of the British Association at its next meeting at Cardiff, it is not unlikely that this and kindred subjects may be brought down this autumn from the upper levels of abstruse discussion, and put forward in such a form that society at large will be able to take sides upon them. The doubts originated at Tulse Hill are very clearly set forth in Miss Clerke's volume in the following passage:—

'The *injection* of the light of burning magnesium into the apparatus simultaneously displaying the spectrum of the Orion nebula had the effect of at once producing a well-separated doublet. The fluting edge lay markedly lower down towards the red than the nebular line. Nor is it likely that a fluting, however attenuated the vapour emitting it, would be reduced to so thin a "remnant" as the sharp, fine line seen in the nebulæ.'

It is scarcely necessary to remark that Professor Lockyer would consider this a highly debateable paragraph. It would, however, give a very wrong impression of Miss Clerke's 'System of the Stars' to speak of it as at all deeply involved in intricate controversy. Though a thoroughly scientific book, it shows also much literary skill. The materials are so well put together and all is explained with so much simplicity that the unlearned will be lured on from chapter to chapter, and led along with a sort of charmed trust in the competence as well as the goodwill of their accomplished guide. The accounts of the colours of the stars and of 'stranger stars' suddenly flaming in the forehead of the sky, the descriptions of the mysterious nebulæ, the explorations of the great sky girdle formed by the Milky Way, and the opinions which have been and are being formed about all these marvels, as Miss Clerke relates or expounds them, cannot fail to put eyes into the heads of many who have hitherto looked upon the glories of the night with only a stupid admiration or dull neglect. The Plates of the Nebulæ, with which the work is illustrated, especially of those in

Orion and the Great Bear, are of much beauty and instructive value.

The speculative opinion, that the universe as we know it has originated in the whirling about of star dust, cannot fail to remind the scholar of that infant philosophy which fancied that the world had been produced by a fortuitous concourse of atoms. The man who could believe that, could as well believe that not the genius of Milton, but the random aggregation of innumerable alphabets of type had composed the poem of 'Paradise Lost.' A sane man would be well assured that only by an almost incredible chance could a single line of it come forth in such a fashion.* He would feel certain that all the order and beauty of heaven and earth could not owe their origin to a force which has never shown itself capable of creating a city or a church, a colonnade or a cottage. But the modern hypothesis is, in fact, far removed from the ancient one, for the concourse of atoms with which modern men of science are concerned has nothing fortuitous about it. There is a great code of laws, laws of motion, of gravitation, of heat, of electricity, of chemical affinity, laws unknown to the early philosophers, as there may be others unknown to us, still waiting to be discovered by the Keplers and Galileos and Newtons of the future. These laws of nature, unlike our puny human enactments, can laugh disobedience to scorn, for they are self-enforced; they leave no room for blind chance, but hold all the atoms, all the masses small or great, cosmic dust and giant orbs, under their absolute and unfaltering sway.

For those to whom the pleasures of the perfect life seem bound to be before all things intellectual pleasures, the scheme of the universe as set forth by modern astronomy extends a boundless prospect. This molecule of a world on

* For the source of this illustration see Cicero, De Natura Deorum, lib. ii. cap. 37: 'Hic ego non mirer esse quemquam, qui sibi persuadeat, corpora quædam solida atque individua vi et gravitate ferri, mundumque effici ornatissimum et pulcherrimum ex eorum corporum concursione fortuitâ? Hoc qui existimat fieri potuisse, non intelligo cur non idem putet, si innumerabiles unius et viginti formæ literarum vel aureæ vel qualeslibet aliquo conjiciantur, posse ex his in terram excussis annales Ennii, ut deinceps legi possint, effici: quod nescio an ne in uno quidem versu possit tantum valere fortuna. . . . Quod si mundum efficere potest concursus atomorum, cur porticum, cur templum, cur domum, cur urbem non potest? quæ sunt minus operosa et multo quidem faciliora.'

which we live, so obscurely small that comparisons fail to express its real insignificance, has hitherto taxed the genius not merely of each man by himself, but of all mankind united to harvest the treasures of knowledge its realms contain. Late in his life an eager student like Charles Kingsley accomplished a long-desired voyage from England to the West Indies, and when he came to record that small achievement, as one who by smiling makes others smile, he led all readers to sympathise with the enraptured exclamation, 'At 'Last!' embodied in the title of his book. 'Nature,' the great traveller Humboldt says, 'is an inexhaustible source of in-'vestigation,' and the whole of his 'Personal Narrative' strikingly illustrates the remark, but the particular occasion which calls it from him is an apology for once more discussing the often discussed flying fish, and in making the remark at all he is evidently thinking only of what is possible to man from his terrestrial standpoint, and under the many limiting conditions of human life. Within these bounds there is room for masterful effort, for delightful surprises, for continual, even if often extremely slow, approaches to a knowledge of all-pervading order and truth. But beyond the narrow confines of this earth and earthly life, it is clear that minds like ours, even with continuously growing powers of perception and reason, might be employed for countless ages without exhausting the mysteries of cosmic clouds and nursling stars and radiant suns, and, above all, of the innumerable orbs that have lost their surface heat, and, in ceasing to shine by their own light, have become habitable, and have therefore doubtless also become inhabited by forms of life and beauty in endless variety past all our poor imagining. However far science may travel into the abysses of space, it finds there all-pervading proof of the Unity of Nature and of that Power by which Nature exists. Light, 'first created beam,' darts by some inconceivable means from the remotest orbs to the human eye; those orbs and even the clouds of stars are found to contain the same physical substances as this earth, and not others; and the whole of this amazing system is governed by a force of which nothing is known but that it is universal and omnipresent.

ART. III.—1. *La Vita Nuova e la Fiammetta.* By R. RENIER. Torino e Roma: 1879.

2. *Abhandlungen über Dante Alighieri.* By Dr. G. A. SCARTAZZINI. Frankfurt: 1886.

3. *Prolegomeni della Divina Commedia.* By Dr. G. A. SCARTAZZINI. Leipzig: 1890.

4. *La Vita Nuova illustrata con Note.* By ALESSANDRO D'ANCONA. Pisa: 1884.

5. *Della Vita di Dante Alighieri.* By A. BARTOLI. Florence: 1884.

6. *Beatrice, Geist und Kern der Dante'schen Dichtungen.* By G. GIETMANN, S.J. Freiburg im Breisgau: 1889.

THE recent occurrence of the six hundredth anniversary of the death of Beatrice, which took place, as Dante distinctly states in the 'Vita Nuova,' on June 9, 1290, has for some time past imparted renewed activity to the controversy, never wholly dormant, who or what was Beatrice? We take occasion of the interest thus awakened to put before our readers some account of the history and principal phases of this controversy. The literature of the subject is very extensive, and continually growing, each year of late having added several fresh contributions to it. We have here prefixed the titles of a few books which form important landmarks in the controversy, selecting them so as to represent each of the principal types under which the conflicting theories fall, giving preference to those of modern date and still easily accessible. We do not wish to discuss the subject as mere partisans, but to present an outline of its history as fairly and impartially as we can. At the same time we may as well say at once that the drift of our discussion will certainly be to vindicate the existence of a literal Beatrice, and to endeavour to rescue her from the limbo of nonentity to which she has lately been dismissed by the ingenuity of modern criticism.

When we speak of the denial of the existence of Beatrice, we do not, of course, mean that it is denied that a person of the name of Beatrice Portinari may have lived, and no doubt some time died, at Florence; but it *is* denied that the Beatrice of Dante,

> 'Di cui la fama ancor nel mondo dura,
> E durerà quanto 'l mondo lontana,'

the Beatrice of the 'Vita Nuova,' and still more the Beatrice of the 'Divina Commedia,' concerning whom Dante has amply redeemed his promise that he would 'say of her that which was never said of any woman,' it is denied, and nowadays very commonly denied, that this Beatrice had any historical reality whatever, and, even if she had, that she had any connexion, except in her fictitious and highly significant name, with that Beatrice Portinari whose lot was cast 'among the Christians of the thirteenth cen-'tury' (*V.N.* c. xxx.) It is in this sense that the denial of the reality of Beatrice is to be understood.

The principal types under which the conflicting theories on this subject fall are three; one of them, however, involves a subdivision on a point of such vital interest that it would perhaps be better to consider them as four in number. It will be convenient to adopt the classification, and to some extent also the nomenclature, suggested by a recent writer and a prominent champion in this controversy, Professor Renier. The three main types may be described as the historical, the ideal, and the symbolical theories, and their advocates may be conveniently referred to as the Realists, the Idealists, and the Symbolists, respectively. The first type scarcely needs explanation, or at any rate it would not do so but for a very important modification of it recently developed, apparently growing in favour, and at any rate forced into prominence by the powerful advocacy of Dr. Scartazzini. The Realists (properly so called) maintain that the Beatrice of Dante was none other than the historical Beatrice Portinari, transfigured by degrees 'from 'glory to glory' in the imagination of the poet, till her image becomes little short of divine, and almost justifies the literal application to her of the Homeric quotation by which she is honoured in the very beginning of the 'Vita Nuova.' But there are certain spurious Realists whom we feel tempted to call 'Separatists,' who admit that the Beatrice of Dante was a real contemporary person whom Dante loved, perhaps called Beatrice, perhaps not; but maintain that she was in any case a separate person from Beatrice Portinari, admitting, however, that beyond that negative assertion nothing more can now be known, or even guessed, concerning her. We shall say a few words as to this fourth type of theorists later on, but meanwhile let it be understood that we reserve the title of Realists for those who (rightly or wrongly) hold the main incidents recorded of Beatrice by Dante to be substantially true, or at least

founded upon fact, and moreover as having occurred in reference to Beatrice, daughter of Folco Portinari, however much she herself, and even some of the events recorded of her, may have been transfigured and idealised in the glowing imagination of the poet.

The distinction intended by the terms *ideal* and *symbolical*, as employed by Professor Renier, is as follows. In the former case the poet is supposed to form an ideally perfect conception of his subject, whatever it may be (in this case womanhood), and when his picture is complete he attaches a name to it. That name may be more or less appropriate or descriptive, but has no relation to any existing being or other entity. The process would be precisely what is described by Aristotle in the Poetics, c. 9, when he says: *συστήσαντες τὸν μῦθον διὰ τῶν εἰκότων οὕτω τὰ τυχόντα ὀνόματα ὑποτιθέασιν.* The idea and the representation of the idea are so far identified that they have no separate existence. A familiar example of the process would be the construction of an ideal state as in Plato, Sir Thomas More, Bacon, &c., which we may call a Republic or a Utopia, or a New Atlantis, or whatever else we please, but which does not profess to have any reality corresponding to it in the nature of things. According to this explanation the Beatrice of Dante is merely 'la donna idealizzata,'* 'the 'ideal of womanhood,' the 'ewig-Weibliche,' the embodiment or incarnation of female perfection, not realised, and never to be realised, on this earth. For around this ideal is shed

> 'A light that never was on sea or land,
> The consecration and the poet's dream.'

This is what is meant by the 'Idealist' theory respecting Beatrice. The most distinguished advocate of this view is Professor Bartoli, and it is strongly maintained also by Professor Renier, already mentioned.

Finally we have what may be called, for want of a better name, the symbolical theory. The symbol (as the term is here employed) is a pure invention of the imagination—an arbitrarily chosen figure or type under which something else is represented, the thing so represented being the sole reality. This is, of course, a very common and familiar process in poetry. Thus the Church in the Apocalypse is

---

* 'Semplicemente incarnazione di qualità naturali alla donna.' Renier, Gior. Stor. ii. p. 390.

depicted under the symbol or figure of the Lamb's wife; or in the Song of Solomon (according to the current explanation in Dante's time) as the Beloved. Again, in the great Mystic Vision in the 'Purgatorio,' the Church on earth is presented under the 'symbol' of a car, led by Christ under the 'symbol' of a gryphon. We can see that in all these cases we have in the 'symbol' no relation to any corresponding object existing outside the poet's or seer's imagination. Just such a 'symbol' is the Beatrice of Dante according to this class of theorists—a symbol having no historical basis whatever, except, perhaps, so far as this: that some are ready to allow that an actual person may in the first instance have turned the poet's thoughts into this channel, and may have thus suggested the *form* of the symbol, and possibly even the *name* finally attached to it. Some would go a step further, and admit that Beatrice Portinari herself may have (so to speak) first flashed the ideal into Dante's mind, though all the details concerning her in the 'Vita Nuova' are purely fictitious, and her historical character entirely vanishes the moment she appears in the pages of Dante. Her name is nothing but a peg on which to hang the web woven by the poet's imagination, like those of the fictitious personages of the 'Pilgrim's Progress.' In that case it becomes a question of very little interest or importance whether the germ or prototype of such a symbol existed in the flesh or not, and whether, if so, she was Beatrice Portinari or anyone else. Our interest in her is gone, and there is also gone with it much of our living interest in Dante himself, since he too fades back with his unsubstantial companion into the region of shadows; and as regards a large portion of his life—and that portion, too, which comes nearest to our personal interests and sympathies—instead of 'a man of like passions 'with ourselves,' *stat magni nominis umbra.*

The first two theories thus sketched—those of the Realists and Idealists—obviously admit of very little variety of detail; but with that of the Symbolists this is not the case. There is room for great difference of opinion as to the interpretation of the symbol; and, as a matter of fact, the upholders of this theory, who are a numerous, and, it would seem, an increasing body, are by no means agreed upon this point, as we shall see presently.

The main facts of the problem are briefly these. Dante himself tells us in the 'Vita Nuova' that he met Beatrice when he was nine years old, and she a year younger, and

that ever thereafter she exercised a commanding influence on his life, though he very seldom met her—still seldomer spoke to her. Her early death, on June 9, 1290, plunged him into inconsolable grief, till at last he resolved not to speak or write of her any more till he should be able to 'say 'of her that which was never said of any woman.' Many years elapsed, during which the 'Convito' and other prose works were written in which Beatrice plays no part, and then, in the closing years of his life, this magnificent promise was amply fulfilled by the composition of the 'Divina 'Commedia,' containing what might almost be called the apotheosis of Beatrice. Dante, it is to be observed, never mentions the family name of Beatrice, and even her Christian name is introduced in such mysterious language that it has been thought to disguise rather than reveal her real name (*V.N.* c. i.)

The early, and in some cases nearly contemporary, commentators afford us on this, as on most other subjects, no definite information. At last Boccaccio comes forward, about forty years after Dante's death and seventy after that of Beatrice, with the definite statement that she was the daughter of Folco Portinari and the wife of Simone de' Bardi. Later writers commonly repeated—we cannot say confirmed—this statement. It rests, and no doubt now always must rest, on the sole and unsupported statement of Boccaccio, whatever may be the value to be attached to that statement. It is hardly necessary to point out that its acceptance is perfectly consistent with 'symbolical' or 'ideal' interpretations of the nature of Beatrice; the former in particular finding place in most of the early commentators, none of whom deny, and many distinctly imply, her real existence.

The first writer to hint a doubt on the subject* is Filelfo, in his highly imaginative and utterly untrustworthy 'Vita

* This statement should, perhaps, be modified by a reference to a very extraordinary passage in the Commentary of Francesco da Buti on Purg. xxvii. 36. He there asserts that Beatrice signifies Theology, which was the true object of Dante's love. Theology, however, is typified by one Beatrice, who lived about 1100, and was the daughter of an emperor of Constantinople, who married an Italian baron and became the mother of the Countess Matilda, the same whom Dante introduces in the next Canto! This Madonna Beatrice (adds Buti) died before 1116, and was buried in the cathedral of Pisa, and 'her sepulchre is with us unto this day.' It should be added that Buti was a Pisan, and his commentary the substance of lectures delivered at Pisa.

'Dantis,' composed in the latter half of the fifteenth century, but not published until 1828, and now extremely difficult to meet with. He boldly says that Beatrice was a pure myth, just as real as Pandora, or any other such fiction of the poet's brain. The whole story of Dante's childish love is an invention of Boccaccio—in short, 'fictam esse rem omnem.' Strictly speaking, therefore, Filelfo scarcely falls under any of our three classes. Beatrice does not 'symbolise' anything: she is too arbitrary and purposeless a poetic fiction to be described as an 'ideal.' But Filelfo is mentioned thus at the outset as being the first to hint at any sceptical suggestion on this subject, and making it, when he does so, in its most extreme and uncompromising form.

The first, however, to work out a 'symbolical' theory, properly so called, was Biscioni, in his 'Prefazione alle Prose 'di Dante' (Florence, 1723). He maintains that Dante's love is purely spiritual or intellectual, and that its true object is Wisdom (*Sapienza*), which is presented under the symbol of Beatrice. He does not think it necessary to deny that a person of this name may have existed at Florence, may have been known to Dante, and may have suggested the name, and to some extent the form, of the symbol, though this is not his own opinion. But he denies that any of the statements of the 'Vita Nuova' are to be literally understood, and says that the term 'Nuova' is applied to this life to express 'sua eccellenza o rarità.' Dante's love for Beatrice means his devotion to wisdom, just as in the 'Convito' Dante himself declares that his affection for the 'Gentil Donna' is to be understood of the pursuit of Philosophy. The maidens who are described as accompanying Beatrice are the several Sciences, the handmaids as it were of Wisdom. The salute of Beatrice implies a readiness and capacity for Knowledge on the part of its votary; the refusal of her salute the difficulties met with in its pursuit. The death of the father of Beatrice represents the loss of Dante's master, presumably Brunetto Latini, though his name is not mentioned by Biscioni, and he offers this suggestion with some hesitation. The highest developement of Wisdom being Theology, Beatrice often definitely represents Theology, just as the Gentil Donna of the 'Con-'vito' represents a lower developement of Wisdom, viz. Moral Philosophy; and so 'le due donne di Dante sono una 'medesima cosa fra loro,' viz. Sapienza.

The general scope of Rossetti's treatment of Dante's works

and their contents, as well as those of other poets of that age, is well known. He held that the Ghibellines formed a society, having a secret language, intelligible to its members only, by means of a code almost as elaborate as a modern book of nautical signals or telegraphic addresses. The mention of a few of these key words will be sufficient to throw light upon the position supposed to be occupied in this system by the symbol 'Beatrice.'* Thus 'Death' means Guelfism, 'Life,' Ghibellinism; and consequently the 'Vita Nuova' means the new course of Dante's political life. 'Amor' (which he does not fail to note is an anagram for *Roma*, and which in its longer form *Amore* may be read *Amo Re*) denotes devotion to the Imperial party; 'Salute' means the Emperor. The 'Empire' is also symbolised by 'God;' and the 'Papacy,' in antagonism with it, by 'Satan.' (Some of our readers will perhaps remember his grotesque reading and interpretation of Inf. vii. l. 1, viz. 'Pap' è Satan, Pap' è Satan,' &c.). 'Heaven' stands for true 'Political Science;' 'Donna' or 'Madonna' represents 'Podestà Imperiale;' and Beatrice also stands for the ideal of this, or rather, to speak more accurately, the ideal regiment which is traced in the 'De Monarchia,' in which a perfect Emperor and a perfect Pope, acting in harmony with one another and each keeping within his proper sphere, should guide the human race to perfect happiness, temporal and eternal. Since, however, as regards the conduct of this life, the Emperor would be naturally the more prominent figure, Beatrice, or 'Beatitudo nostra,' often appears to stand for this ideal 'Imperial Power.' Our limits prevent our going into further detail. It should be added that Rossetti assigns the same allegorical meaning to the writings of Guido Cavalcanti, Guido Guinicelli, Cino da Pistoia, Petrarch, Boccaccio, and many other less known poets,† and in particular the 'ladies' extolled by each of these writers—Giovanna, by Guido Cavalcanti; Selvaggia, by Cino da Pistoia; Laura, by

* These may be taken either from the 'Disamina del Sistema Allegorico della Divina Commedia,' cap. ii. (Com. Analitico, vol. ii. p. 354, &c.), or from the Spirito Antipapale, *passim*, and esp. c. x.

† Rossetti's curious interpretation of Par. xxvi. 133–6 is too good to lose. Reading 'I' in l. 134, and 'El' in l. 136, he explains the former as standing for 'Imperator,' and the latter for 'Enrico Lussemburghese;' and so the whole passage means, being interpreted, that just before Dante began his poem ('Pria ch' io scendessi all' infernale ambascia,' l. 133), the secret symbol of his political sect was changed from 'I' to 'El' (!!).

Petrarch; and Fiammetta, by Boccaccio—are held to be mere symbols of similar significance to the Beatrice of Dante. *He further admits that Dante may have loved, or* feigned to have loved, a Florentine maiden named Beatrice; but that the Beatrice of his writings, both in prose and verse, was a pure symbol or figure, having no more connexion with real life than the *fuia*, or *puttana*, or *meretrice*, who took her place on the deserted and distorted car in the vision in Purg. xxxiii. He thinks (like some other writers on this subject) that her connexion with Beatrice Portinari is summarily disproved by such shallow arguments as these. 'In what history is it recorded that the Pope carried away 'the Empire or the Church from the daughter of Messer Folco 'Portinari, or the wife of Messer Simone de' Bardi?' We may put side by side with this a no less surprising would-be demonstration of Gietmann (of whom more presently) that it is inconceivable, and, if conceivable, would indicate an utter want of taste and sense of poetic propriety on the part of Dante, that he should make Beatrice Portinari a symbol of Theology, or Revealed Religion, because, forsooth, she was an undistinguished member of ordinary Florentine society of the period, without even any recorded literary tastes, much less any scholastic or theological knowledge, or any special training in divinity! (p. 2). Such arguments as these are commonly and, indeed, prominently put forward, yet they seem really to establish nothing more than the inability of their nineteenth century authors to enter into the spirit or comprehend the modes of thought of the fourteenth century.

The most recent, and in some respects the most hardy and thoroughgoing in his interpretation of points of detail, among the advocates of the 'symbolical' theory is Gietmann, a member of the Society of Jesus, whose views are set forth in a work recently published entitled 'Beatrice, Geist und 'Kern der Dante'schen Dichtungen.' His general conclusion differs from any of those which we have hitherto considered. It is thus summarised by himself in his Preface (p. iv)—

'Our object is, in a word, to prove that Dante's love for the daughter of Folco Portinari probably belongs to the number of those beautiful dreams which have been woven round the whole of the poet's life by the hands of his interpreters and biographers, but that in any case the primary and the real subject of his poetry is nothing else than the *Ideal Church*, the Bride, or the Beloved of Scripture, as represented by Solomon, S. Paul, and S. John.'

A little later on Gietmann adds that he does not, of course,

mean to deny that a person called Beatrice Portinari existed, but that she is certainly not the subject of Dante's writings, and *that, as he justly adds, is the sole ground on which she has any interest for us*; moreover, that the information that has reached us as to any affection on the part of Dante for any such historical person is almost, if not altogether, undeserving of credit. The working out by Gietmann of his theory in its application to the details of the 'Vita Nuova' lands him in some very startling results, which, however, he does not hesitate to put forth and maintain as being the logical consequences of his theory. We may regard him, then, as the most important and most systematic advocate of the Symbolist view, and since so much in regard to this class of theories depends on the interpretation of the 'Vita 'Nuova,' it will be well to take the opportunity of recounting its main incidents step by step with Gietmann's explanations.

It should be noted in passing that, speaking roughly, the main difficulty of the Symbolist and Idealist theories lies in the hard facts and often minute personal details occurring in the 'Vita Nuova,' whereas the main difficulty of the Realists lies in the mystical language applied to Beatrice, and the exalted position assigned to her in the 'Divina 'Commedia.'

The 'Vita Nuova' begins, as is well known, with an account of the first meeting of Beatrice and Dante, then aged eight and nine years respectively. He describes the immediate and overwhelming effect which her presence at once, and for ever afterwards, produced upon him, and he introduces her Christian name, and her Christian name only, in that mysterious and highly ambiguous sentence which plays so important a part in the arguments of those who deny the literal sense—'There appeared to my eyes the glorious 'lady of my mind'—'la donna della mia mente' (not 'cuore') an expression much commented on, as implying unreality at the very outset—'who was called by many 'Beatrice, i quali non sapeano che si chiamare.' These last words are very difficult to translate. We take them (with Witte, D'Ancona, Scartazzini, and others) to mean literally—'Many called her Beatrice, who did not know 'what they were calling her,' i.e. who knew not the deep significance and full appropriateness of the name. Rightly was she called Beatrice; she was *κάρτ' ἐπώνυμος*, just as Homer says of the daughter of Alcinous, *Ἀρήτη δ' ὄνομ' ἐστὶν ἐπώνυμος*, and as Esau declares of his brother, 'rightly is

'he called Jacob,' though (as we might add) they who so called him were not conscious how appropriate the name was. Compare by all means the reference to the significance of the names Giovanna and Primavera in ch. xxiv., and also to that of the names of the parents of S. Dominic in Par. xii. 79–81. Of course Gietmann, like other Symbolists, insists that it is altogether unnatural and improbable that a boy of nine years should have experienced such a vehement and enduring emotion.

Here and elsewhere we must protest at once against applying the test of ordinary experience to a case like that of Dante. It is quite beside the point. Here, and in many other aspects of Dante's character, it must be borne in mind *that we are dealing with an altogether exceptional nature,* exceptional not only in genius but also in its sensational, emotional, and imaginative side. There is, to our thinking, nothing more 'unnatural' in what here purports to be recorded of Dante as a boy of nine—this infant giant in the sphere of Poetry—than the prodigies of youthful and almost infantile precocity recorded as undoubted facts of such giants in the sphere of music as Beethoven, Mozart, Mendelssohn, or, we might add, some of the almost incredible statements of early intellectual development related of himself by John Stuart Mill in his Autobiography. In any case we venture to submit that the literal meaning here offers an explanation much less difficult and less unnatural than the symbolical. For what had Dante, or any other boy at the age of nine, to do with ecstatic visions of the 'Ideal Church'? We prefer to face the improbability of supposing that a boy of that age was thus affected, or, at any rate, in after years believed that he thus early began to be so affected, by the vision of an actual girl in flesh and blood.

Passing on now to the most prominent and striking incidents of the 'Vita Nuova' as they follow in the order of the narrative, we are first arrested by the curious episode of the lady rather unceremoniously described as 'the screen' (chapter v.). Dante, while gazing at Beatrice saying her prayers in church, and while he presumably ought to have been doing the same, pretended to be looking at another lady who was in a direct line between them, and this misled the gossips of Florence into supposing that this second lady was the real object of his attention, a mistake which Dante found it convenient to encourage, not without causing some annoyance to the lady who served as 'the screen.' This

continued for some months, and even years, and Dante confesses to having addressed some verses to this lady, and to having attempted further mystification of his friends by composing a *sirventese*, in which sixty of the most beautiful maidens of Florence, including Beatrice and 'the screen,' were celebrated. According to Gietmann, 'the lady of the 'screen' represents the ministering priesthood which comes between the faithful and the invisible and ideal Church. The sixty maidens are thought by Gietmann to be nothing but a reminiscence of the sixty queens mentioned in the Song of Solomon (vi. 8). The full passage runs: 'There 'are sixty queens, and eighty concubines, and virgins with-'out number. My dove, my undefiled is but one.' This *explanation of the choice of the actual number sixty (anticipated, we may note, in the much earlier work of Aroux)* is certainly ingenious, and may even be perfectly true, without its amounting to any sort of proof that Beatrice is a mere symbol and not a real person.

In chapter vii. we are told that 'the lady of the screen' left the city, and in chapters viii. and ix. that one of the companions of Beatrice died, and that both of these occurrences were the occasion of much sorrow to Dante. Next, that Love appeared in a vision to Dante and ordered him to make a 'screen' of another lady, whom he named, and that Dante did so, thereby giving occasion to much unpleasant talk which resulted in the refusal of Beatrice to notice him when they next met (chapters ix. and x.). All this is intended, according to Gietmann, to indicate, under different images, that the intermediate and visible priesthood had come to occupy too large a place in his heart, so as to divert his thoughts from the ideal and invisible Church; hence that in his spiritual developement it was expedient for him that they should be removed from his sight. It should have been observed that the greeting of Beatrice at their first meeting mentioned in chapter ii. is explained by Gietmann to refer to Dante's traditional, though very uncertain, admission in his youth for a brief period to the noviciate of the Franciscan order, by which he thought himself at the time to have reached 'tutti i termini della 'beatitudine.' And, on the other hand, the refusal of her greeting in ch. x. is supposed to indicate Dante's alienation from Theology, through his alleged devotion to secular pursuits and profane Philosophy, an episode which plays so important a part in Dante's history according to some writers, and is as vigorously denied by others.

We must next notice the very remarkable incident of the marriage feast narrated in ch. xiv. Dante was taken by a friend to witness a gathering of many very beautiful maidens who were assembled, according to the custom of the city, to do honour to a lady who was given in marriage on that same day. Among them he at once beheld Beatrice herself. He was utterly stunned and prostrated at the sight of her, supported himself against a painting that ran round the wall of the room, and ultimately had to be removed by his friend, to whom he addressed the mysterious words: 'I have to-day set my feet on that point of life 'beyond which he cannot pass who has any thought of re-'tracing his steps.' On this Gietmann remarks that it is utterly impossible to take this literally, as it would make Dante simply contemptible. Here, then, at any rate, he says, we must abandon the literal sense. Rather we should say, here, at any rate, we feel constrained to accept it. If, as is generally supposed, and as we confidently believe, Dante here refers to the marriage of Beatrice herself, observe the exquisite tact with which this difficult and delicate subject is handled. The same consideration for the feelings of others which, if the traditional history of Beatrice be true, led him to suppress her actual name, as well as that of the city 'in which God had placed her,' reinforced, moreover, in this particular matter by considerations of artistic propriety also, would prevent his stating directly even the fact of her marriage. Yet, how was such a cardinal event in her history and his own to be entirely ignored? Moreover, when we read thus between the lines can we not better understand the crushing agony which he describes as falling upon him, and the oracular language addressed to his friend? It is also very significantly observed by Dr. Witte, though we are not aware of the grounds on which the curious assertion rests, that according to the custom of Florence, conversely to that now prevailing among ourselves, the companions of a bride at her marriage were always themselves married ladies. If so, the natural inference would be that the occasion was the marriage of Beatrice herself, else she could not have been present. The incident taken literally, and thus interpreted, is one of the most touching, and we may even venture to add, one of the most natural, recorded in the 'Vita Nuova.'

What then has Gietmann to offer us as an alternative? Why, that Dante's bewilderment indicates the effect on the soul of its first introduction to the contemplative aspect of

theology, and he quotes in illustration similar language of mystical writers like S. Theresa, describing that experience and its overwhelming effects. If anyone thinks this a more 'natural' explanation, he is welcome to a conviction, which would probably be argument-proof.

The next great event recorded is the death of the father of Beatrice, in chapter xxii. It should be observed in passing that in any case Dante's narrative, whether to be taken literally or not, corresponds most accurately here with literal facts. Folco Portinari did actually die in 1289, the year before the death of Beatrice; the very day of his death is known (December 31). His will is extant (executed January 15, 1287), in which he leaves a legacy of fifty pounds to his daughter Beatrice, wife of Simone de' Bardi. He was also the founder of the large Hospital of S. Maria Nuova, at Florence, still existing, where he was buried with the honours of a public funeral. All this agrees exactly with the statement of Dante respecting the father of Beatrice, that he was a man reputed, and, as Dante adds, very truly reputed, to be a man of great goodness ('buono in alto grado'). The bitter grief of Beatrice at the loss of her father is described, and Dante declares himself to have been crushed with sympathetic sorrow, much intensified by a vivid presentiment that Beatrice herself too would die, followed by a vision of her as actually dead. He was prostrated on a bed of sickness, and then (let us note the particularity of these details) he narrates how he was tended and comforted by a young and gentle lady who was standing beside his sick bed as he lay sobbing and calling upon death, a lady (as he is careful to add) who was of his very near kindred ('la quale era 'meco di propinquissima sanguinità congiunta,' ch. xxiii.). It has been reasonably conjectured that this was his own sister, who was married (as we learn from Boccaccio) to Leon Poggi, and had a son very strongly resembling his uncle, Dante. Again we ask, what can be more natural and touching than all this taken literally? Gietmann would have us believe that the death of Beatrice's father is the *rifiuto* of Celestine in 1294, and that at the prospect of the imminent ruin of the Church (i.e. the death of Beatrice) some form or type of worldly philosophy offers its aid and support to the perplexed mind of Dante.*

Chapter xxiv. introduces another striking incident. Dante

* Another recent writer of the Symbolist school maintains that the father of Beatrice represents S. Thomas Aquinas!

has once more a sight of Beatrice, on this occasion accompanied, or rather preceded, by a maiden of great beauty, 'che 'fu già molto donna di questo mio primo amico,' i.e. to whom for a long time this first of my friends was much devoted, viz. Guido Cavalcanti. Her name was Giovanna, though she was often and deservedly described as Primavera, both these names having a true significance for one who now appeared as the 'Forerunner' of Beatrice. Guido, as we know, proved unfaithful to Giovanna, and transferred his poetic devotion to another lady called Mandétta. Dante seems gently and delicately to hint this reproach in the words just quoted 'fu già molto donna,' &c., as well as in some other somewhat ambiguous words later on in the chapter. Now why should not these details be accepted literally (corresponding as they do in several respects with known facts), and if not, what purpose, moral or artistic, is served by this minuteness of imaginary detail? But let us now hear Gietmann again. The reappearance of Beatrice (in ch. xxiv.) after her vision in death (ch. xxiii.) corresponds with the hopes derived from the accession of Benedict XI. in 1304, and his short reign of nine months, after the death of Boniface VIII. But if the death of Beatrice's father and the presage of her own imminent death have reference to the *rifiuto* of Celestine in 1294, while the incidents of this chapter relate to the reign of Benedict XI., we have an unexplained interval of ten years, a supposition which, improbable in itself, is made impossible by the marks of time (see ch. xxiv.), which distinctly (and, if Gietmann be right, quite needlessly, and even misleadingly) bring the events of ch. xxiii. and xxiv. into connexion and proximity. Besides, what purpose is served by the introduction of Giovanna, and the references to Guido Cavalcanti? Gietmann says that the former is like Matilda (with whom indeed some have proposed to identify her), and also like the 'lady of the screen' (herself again by Scartazzini identified with Matilda) a symbol of the visible priesthood. But why should this fresh symbol be introduced here? Still more, why should Giovanna and Dante's friend Guido Cavalcanti be dragged in here in such a connexion? Gietmann can only suggest that perhaps Dante wished us to understand that Guido and himself were of one mind in intending all they said or wrote about Giovanna and Beatrice to be equally and purely allegorical.

Next, after a few less important chapters, we have the crowning event of the death of Beatrice in ch. xxix. This

represents according to Gietmann the removal of the Papacy to Avignon by Clement V. in the year 1305. Now Dante expressly declares that Beatrice died on June 9, 1290, and also that she was then twenty-four years of age, statements which, on Gietmann's theory, would be both irrelevant and inappropriate. Further, Dante himself distinctly states (in Convito i. 1) the 'Vita Nuova' to be a work of his youth, i.e. (according to the explanation of the term in Conv. iv. 24) when he was about twenty-five, viz. c. 1290, or soon afterwards. Gietmann is compelled to place its composition, or at any rate that of the last fifteen chapters, in the year 1314, partly for reasons already implied, and still more on account of the letter which Dante says that he addressed 'ai 'principi della terra,' which Gietmann confidently identifies with that addressed by Dante to the cardinals in conclave at Carpentras, after the death of Clement V., and dated April 30, 1314. The two letters have undoubtedly a remarkable point of coincidence in the opening words, 'Quo-'modo sedet sola civitas,' &c. But it is obvious to remark that the repetition of a familiar quotation is a very insufficient ground of identification. A great deal, moreover, turns on the interpretation of the term 'principi della terra,' which is assumed by Gietmann and others to refer to the cardinals. This would not be certain, even if we could be sure that the words mean 'princes of the earth.' But this is far from being the case. For Fraticelli takes *terra* as equivalent to *città* or *paese*. So also do D. G. Rossetti and Scartazzini, the latter paraphrasing the words 'i personaggi 'principali di Firenze.' Moreover, Gabriele Rossetti ('La 'Beatrice di Dante,' p. 74), even assuming *terra* to mean 'the earth,' makes merry over the idea of Dante writing (not to the cardinals, but) to Germany, France, England, and Spain, to announce the death of the daughter of Folco Portinari. He also equally ridicules the notion that *principi della terra* can refer to the Gonfaloniere and other magistrates of Florence, and asks triumphantly what has become of the letter? But is it not possible that just as the universal desolation of the city at the death of Beatrice is itself a poetic fiction, a form of the 'pathetic fallacy' most common in poetry, even as Shelley describes it—

> 'Thus all things were
> Transformed into the agony which I wore'—

is it not possible that the letter itself was an artificial and ideal composition like the sonnets and canzoni by which it

is surrounded, and not a formal document, 'signed, sealed, 'and delivered,' any more than they, to the persons to whom it purports to be addressed? Or again, even if all this were ever so formally carried out, why may not the letter have disappeared like the *sirventese* of chapter vi., and many other similar compositions?

But in any case Gietmann asks us to suppose that it was written in 1314, whereas the death of Beatrice, to which it refers, took place, as Dante states, in 1290, and even the allegorical equivalent, as explained by Gietmann, occurred in 1305. If so, why was it composed either twenty-four or nine years after the event to which it refers, especially as Dante (very misleadingly) states at the beginning of chapter xxxi. that it was composed when the death of Beatrice was quite recent?

In chapters xxxiii. and xxxiv. we meet with some more very definite personal allusions, which it is difficult to understand otherwise than literally. In ch. xxxiii. Dante says that he received a visit from his second greatest friend, next after the first who has been already mentioned (ch. xxiv.), and who was also so closely allied in blood relationship to Beatrice that there was none nearer to her. Now, her father being dead, this expression would most naturally describe her brother, and indeed this is distinctly stated in ch. xxxiv. This appears to be the only reference made by Dante to this close friendship; but that does not involve any serious difficulty, since very little of his own life and its circumstances is recorded by him outside the limits of the 'Vita Nuova.' The friend thus described came to ask him to write somewhat in reference to a lady that was dead, suppressing the mention of her name. Dante, however, understood his meaning, and complied with his request by composing a sonnet; but thinking it unworthy to be presented to one so dear to her, wrote two stanzas of a canzone also, the former portion of which is spoken as by her brother, and the latter as by Dante himself, her servant. Gietmann seems to think that this brother of Beatrice may represent the ecclesiastical hierarchy, or perhaps some prominent member of it. But again, we ask, why may we not understand this and other similar passages literally? If such comparatively small incidents actually occurred, we can understand their being thus recorded; if not, they were surely not worth inventing, for either they have no appropriate allegorical significance, or, if they have any such meaning, it is so extremely obscure and far fetched that it can scarcely be called appropriate.

We feel that we might apply here the criticism of Aristotle in the Poetics in reference to the occurrence of unimportant or inappropriate incidents in a poem. If they are historical, says Aristotle, that is the poet's excuse; if not, and if he had a free hand (as we say), then it is a flaw in his work, *ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ οὐ δεῖ συνίστασθαι τοιούτους μύθους* (c. xxiv.).

The remainder of the 'Vita Nuova' need not detain us further now. We must not overload this already too protracted discussion with entering on the thorny question of the 'gentil donna,' to whom for a time, and in a sense which is still a matter of great dispute, Dante's affections were transferred after the death of Beatrice. Long as this discussion in one sense has been, we do not pretend to have given to the elaborate work of Gietmann (two hundred closely printed pages) anything like so complete a discussion or analysis as such a work might justly claim. We must, however, in conclusion, protest against the bad taste as well as against the question-begging process involved in Gietmann's practice of quoting from time to time the most sublime and mystical expressions applied to Beatrice both in the 'Vita Nuova' and the 'Divina Commedia' as being inappropriate to 'Frau Bardi' (for so he habitually refers to her), or, as he says in one passage, 'die achtbare Frau Bardi, 'geborene Portinari'!

Having now considered at some length the most typical of the 'Symbolist' expositions, we can dismiss the others with a brief notice. The speculations of Gietmann, and even of Rossetti, appear sober reason compared with the wild rhapsodies of Aroux, the very title of whose work prepares us in some degree for its strange contents—'Dante, 'Hérétique, Révolutionnaire, et Socialiste' (1854). Aroux likewise analyses the 'Vita Nuova' step by step, though of course we cannot now follow him. For him the whole of the 'Vita Nuova' is an elaborate and carefully disguised enunciation of the Gnostic and Manichean heresies condemned and anathematised by the Church, while Beatrice is nothing else but Dante's own soul personified. Beatrice is one with himself, and also with Amore, thus forming a mystery or miracle of the Trinity (referring, of course, especially to Dante's language in 'Vita Nuova,' ch. xxx.). This miracle, however, is created by Dante himself, who is himself man made in the image of God, and three in one like God, by means of intelligence, memory, and will (see Purg. xxv. 83), and—we owe our readers an apology for continuing a quotation of which it is hard to say whether the profanity or the

absurdity is the more surprising—'Dante is himself the 'Father, the Son, and the Spirit of Beatrice, in whom he 'contemplates his own syzygy'! It will scarcely be thought necessary that we should dwell longer on a theory of which this is the summary.

A very important contributor to the discussion of this question, as of almost every other arising out of the writings of Dante, is Scartazzini. It is very difficult to classify him, because, as in the case of many other controverted points, his views have varied considerably at different times, and the opinion to which he has finally settled down combines some of the features of all the classes of theories which we have indicated. He has discussed the subject in 'Dante, 'seine Zeit, sein Leben, und seine Werke,' 1879; also in his 'Abhandlungen über Dante Alighieri,' 1880; in the 'Vita 'di Dante,' Hoepli's 'Manuali,' 1883; in several articles in German and Italian periodicals; and finally in his elaborate 'Prolegomeni' to his edition of the 'Divina Commedia,' 1890. In the two earliest of these works he insists very strongly on the historical reality of Beatrice, and, indeed, of Beatrice Portinari, as being absolutely incontestable, and, moreover, that she was in a literal sense the object of Dante's affection, though also in a perfectly pure and ideal sense. He admits (with D'Ancona) the gradual though speedy retirement of the real figure behind the allegorical or symbolical meaning in the 'Vita Nuova' itself, while in the 'Divina 'Commedia' the latter has almost extinguished the former. He will not, however, admit that even here Beatrice is 'eine 'blosse Allegorie.' In the 'Seine Zeit, sein Leben, und seine 'Werke,' while asserting the reality of Beatrice quite as emphatically, he adds that he believes the object of Dante's love was directly and primarily an ideal, and only in a secondary sense the maiden of flesh and blood in whom he believed that ideal to be embodied, and only so far as he imagined it to be so embodied. In the same work he accepts the testimony of Boccaccio as to the main facts and as to the identification of the Beatrice of Dante's writings with Beatrice Portinari, though he rejects the details of their first meeting given by Boccaccio as mere poetic and fanciful amplifications. It is 'eine novellartige Erzäh-'lung.' His opinion, however, as to the value of Boccaccio's work has undergone a very serious change, and in several more recent utterances, and notably in the recently published 'Prolegomeni,' he seems scarcely able to find language strong enough to denounce the worthlessness of Boccaccio,

whom he now regards as an utterly untrustworthy romancer. He will not accept him as evidence for any fact whatever. His final views on the whole subject may be summed up in the two following conclusions: (1) Whoever or whatever Beatrice was, she became—at any rate for Dante—little else than a pure symbol, a symbol representing the ideal Papacy, leading mankind to the happiness of Heaven, just as Virgil, the symbol of the ideal Empire, leads mankind (in the person of Dante) to the highest earthly happiness, that of the Earthly Paradise. This seems to take little or no account of what is said about Beatrice in the 'Vita 'Nuova,' and to have regard to the 'Divina Commedia' only. (2) The Beatrice of Dante, though she was a real person, was certainly *not* Beatrice Portinari, certainly not the wife of Simone de' Bardi. Further, Scartazzini believes 'che 'la Beatrice di Dante visse e morì nubile, che morì amata e '*amante* del Poeta.' This opinion, which he has maintained in isolated articles before, is elaborately defended in his recently published 'Prolegomeni' by fifteen arguments. Not, however, to interrupt the order of this discussion, we omit the consideration of this view for the present, and we must recall Scartazzini later on, so far as he represents this variety of the Realist theory, dealing first, according to the plan proposed, with the Symbolists and Idealists.

We omit further reference to the earlier treatises of Perez and Centofanti, their works being now very difficult to meet with, and their views, as cited by later writers, differing in points of detail, rather than in general principles of interpretation from other Symbolist theories already treated of. We pass on therefore now to another class of writers, viz. those who maintain the Ideal theory, i.e. that in Beatrice we have not a 'symbol,' but an 'ideal,' in fact the idealisation of womanhood, which Dante thus personifies and incarnates, if we may so say. The principal exponents of this theory are Professor Bartoli and Professor Renier, in their works named at the head of this article and elsewhere. The principal arguments on which these writers rely will be now explained, without adopting the exact arrangement or language of either of them, so that by thus fusing them together needless repetition may be avoided.

1. It is argued that the worship of woman, or womanhood, was the characteristic feature of the whole contemporary, and for a century and more antecedent, school or cycle of poetry in Provence, Sicily, Bologna, and still more in that of the 'stil nuovo' with which Dante associates himself in

Purg. xxiv. 57. It is further alleged that this worship was always veiled in the profession of love for some woman, ostensibly a person, but more truly a personification, towards whom the love of the poet was purely fictitious, and that his whole poetry, in its outward aspect amatory, was really dialectic and philosophical. Among other indications of the unreality of these expressions of love, it is urged that in no case does the 'donna' of their poetry correspond with the wife of the poet, either before or after marriage, even when there is no suspicion of conjugal infidelity or estrangement. Thus Cino da Pistoia, who sings the praises of Selvaggia Vergiolesi, was himself married and had five children; and Guido Cavalcanti extols Giôvanna in his poetry though he was married (as we all know) to the daughter of Farinata degli Uberti. Dante himself had at least five, some say seven, children by his wife Gemma Donati; and whatever may have been their relations together, there is not a particle of evidence for the unfavourable gossip of some of the so-called biographers. Thus an ideal 'donna' was a sort of necessary part of a poet's equipment, and Dante must needs therefore furnish himself with a name-bearing ideal like his brethren. So it is argued. Now there is an element of truth in all this. There is no doubt that the term Love, among other senses, bore a meaning for 'the Christians of the thirteenth century' which has passed out of later experience. Doubtless then, as now, the term love was applied both to matrimonial affection on the one hand, and to animal passion on the other. But there was also another sentiment distinct from either of these, and able to co-exist perhaps with both, but certainly with the former, the chivalrous devotion to a woman, neither wife nor mistress, by means of which the spirit of man, were he knight or poet, was rendered capable of self-devotion and noble deeds, and of rising to a higher ideal of life.* We must not embark on a subject demanding a treatise in itself. But it is necessary to maintain that this sentiment was not the less a real emotion, not the less truly felt because it is now perhaps obsolete, if indeed it is so. It is a sentiment which, in the beautiful language of Wordsworth—

> 'teaches less to love than to adore,
> If that be not indeed the highest love.'

At any rate, it is as much a *fact*, that must be taken account

* See Symonds' 'Study of Dante,' pp. 243, 245.

of in the interpretation of the writings of that age, as the habit of allegorising the events of history or of daily life. If we choose to ignore this, and, starting from the modern experience and modern associations of a term, insist upon judging from this standpoint what was written under entirely different circumstances and mental surroundings, the whole of our criticism is vitiated at its very root. We may go further, and say that, apart from the characteristic differences of different centuries, Dante is himself in some respects *sui generis*. 'Dante's relation to Beatrice,' says Döllinger, 'to 'this combination of the earthly and the heavenly, of 'abstract symbolism with the most living personality, is 'something quite unique, unexperienced in any other human 'life.'

And as to the other limb or branch of this argument, viz. that as the feeling was artificial and unreal—which we deny—so also was its object: that also we deny no less emphatically. Not only to these old poets was the worship of an ideal womanhood an elevating and ever present influence, but, further, that ideal was as constantly and as necessarily associated with some definite individual as the Jewish notions of Deity were with some concrete idol. And, to carry on the illustration, we may observe that, in any stage higher than mere fetichism, the idol or image is a help to the mind of the worshipper, not the final object of his adoration.

2. Next, besides the inferences already dealt with as based upon certain ambiguous expressions, like 'donna della 'mente,' &c., in 'Vita Nuova,' ch. i., Professor Renier argues that, as in the 'Convito,' Dante expressly says that the eyes and the smile of the ideal lady of his mind represent the demonstrations and the persuasions (or the 'sweet reason-'ableness') of Philosophy, so we must apply the same interpretation to the language of the 'Vita Nuova.' Possibly so; but this does not prove that they have not a real and literal sense *besides*, any more than the association of the sun, moon, and planets with the several sciences in the 'Convito' requires us to maintain that they have no proper place in astronomy also.

3. It is argued, if the 'Vita Nuova' is in any sense a history, why is it made up of a series of dreams and visions, most of which certainly cannot be understood as literal facts? To this we reply, that Dante of course idealised the bare facts in a very considerable degree. He is not writing a chronicle or a matter-of-fact history, but a poem in prose.

But we may still maintain, that all the coruscations of his fancy sparkle forth from a core of solid fact.

4. As an argument of a similar kind, the prominence and frequent recurrence of the number nine in all the alleged events of Beatrice's life, especially in view of the mystical importance attached to the phenomenon by Dante, is said to be another proof of the fabulous character of the whole story. Here, again, we are quite prepared to admit that Dante has perhaps not been *ἀκριβὴς ὥσπερ λογογράφος*. At the same time there are, no doubt, plenty of such curious coincidences in actual life to be traced out by the ingenuity of one who is on the look-out for them, and who is also prepared to disregard exceptions and points of difference, and to record only points of agreement with his theory. That such curious coincidences do occur in real life is a simple fact of experience. And it is plainly what Bacon would call an 'idolon tribus,' and a palpable logical fallacy, to argue hence as to the unreality of the whole of an alleged history connected with them, or, short of thus openly arguing, even to allow oneself to feel in an atmosphere of general suspicion and uncertainty respecting it. If the story of the Papal aggression in 1850 had only appeared in the Old Testament, it would have been discredited long ago; since no intelligent modern critic would allow us to accept as sober history a narrative which informed us that this great and startling religious movement was originated by Pius and carried into effect by Wiseman, while the leaders of the contemporary innovating parties in the Church, in the two opposite directions of Ecclesiasticism and Rationalism, were both called Newman; and further, that they were significantly, though no less incredibly, described as actual brothers. We all need to be reminded sometimes of the true paradox of Agathon, 'It is likely that many things 'should happen that are unlikely.'

5. Again, the silence of Dante as to the family name of Beatrice, as to the name of the city where she lived, and as to other definite details that might have been looked for in the case of a real person, has been urged in proof that she is only an ideal. To this may be added, as a supplementary argument, that the language in which she is often described (as, e.g. in Inf. ii. 77, 103, and very frequently in the Par.) is altogether exaggerated if applied to any mortal woman, and is suitable only to an abstract ideal of womanly perfection.

Now, as to the first of these arguments, we reply that *if*

the facts truly were as handed down by Boccaccio, Dante and Beatrice being both married to others, there is quite sufficient reason for Dante's reticence, both on artistic and on personal grounds.* And as to the latter argument, not to dwell on such parallel cases as Dante's own language in the 'Convito' about the idealised yet historical Cato, or Petrarch's language about Laura, or that of Guittone, Guido Cavalcanti, and other contemporary poets, or, again, that of Cino da Pistoia (e.g. Sonnet 113), we freely admit that in such passages the ideal, so to speak, swallows up the real, just as in those passages which describe, or purport to describe, facts and events, the real swallows up the ideal. For we do not for a moment deny or seek to depreciate the truth of the ideal theory about Beatrice; only we say that it is not the whole truth. Beatrice was certainly the ideal of womanhood for Dante, but not *therefore* the less a real person; and Dante's devotion, adoration, love—whatever we please to call it—was always much more for the ideal Beatrice, which 'he had made for himself to worship,' than for the actual Beatrice, daughter of Folco Portinari; and this, doubtless, far more than he was himself at all aware. But is this an experience entirely unknown even in this matter-of-fact age?

6. Finally, there is a serious difficulty arising out of the fourteenth and fifteenth chapters of the 'Vita Nuova,' a serious difficulty on any theory about Beatrice, and one which we did not deal with in analysing the 'Vita Nuova' in connexion with Gietmann's *symbolical* theory, because it is more prominently brought forward by Bartoli as a very strong point in favour of his *ideal* theory. We are referring to the very difficult subject of what is termed 'il gabbo di Beatrice,' the jeering or mocking of Dante by Beatrice at the wedding feast. It has been represented by Bartoli as an insuperable objection to the literal interpretation, since it would represent Beatrice as acting in an unfeeling and even offensive manner. He concludes a somewhat lengthy discussion—'Bisogna 'cercare la spiegazione di quel mistero; ma la spiegazione 'non si trova se non negando la storicità del racconto.' One would like a little more 'spiegazione' than this mere negation. In particular one would desire to be informed how the difficulty is diminished by supposing this unlikely incident to have been arbitrarily invented, and how, if such

* Besides, as Del Lungo remarks, 'I cognomi son materia ribelle al linguaggio poetico.'

conduct is unseemly in the historical Beatrice, it is to be explained in reference to the ideal of womanhood of whom (according to Bartoli) she is the type. Moreover Bartoli's argument depends for much of its force on the absurd supposition, made by himself, that Beatrice, who now jeered at Dante, had at one time encouraged and even returned his affection! 'E la Beatrice di Dante pare infatti che ceda 'all' amore del suo poeta; la giovinetta bellissima *lo guarda* 'e *lo saluta*. La passione *dunque* (!!) è sentita anche da lei.' Was ever a conclusion based on such preposterously slender grounds? *Lo guarda e lo saluta; dunque*, &c. Why should the passing salute of Beatrice have been of this very compromising character? Why should it have had a significance almost as full of meaning as the nod of Lord Burleigh in 'The Critic'? It must be confessed that the *gabbo* is a difficulty, but it would be very greatly diminished if we suppose (and it is surely both possible and probable to suppose) that *Beatrice was herself quite unaware of Dante's devotion to her*. One thing is quite certain: 'he never told his 'love.' On the contrary, he took every means to conceal it, and to put people on the wrong scent, passing even the bounds of courtesy (as we have seen) with this object. Let us remember that he first saw her at the age of nine, and then after nine years more had passed, and so when he was eighteen, she passed him in the street in the company of two ladies older than herself and saluted him in passing, and this, he says, was the very first time that any words from her had reached his ears. The next thing mentioned after this is the incident of the 'lady of the screen' which resulted in such evil rumours as to Dante's conduct that the next time Beatrice met him she refused to notice him. A mysterious vision follows in which Amore appears to Dante, and is made to tell him that though his love must needs be known to her by this time (observe, this is only a vision, and represents in point of fact nothing but the communings of Dante's own thoughts), yet that he should expound the truth in a song, but still in such a manner as to speak *under the disguise of another*, and not to address Beatrice directly himself, 'che non è degno.' It is just after this that the incident of the marriage scene (in ch. xiv.) occurs, when, according to his own showing, Dante's conduct must have been most strange and unaccountable, not to say ridiculous, to those who did not know his secret, and then it was that Beatrice joined the other ladies in laughing at him. This *gabbo* may not, indeed, have been 'ideal' conduct on

Beatrice's part; in fact, we maintain that it was certainly not this; but the difficulty involved is very much diminished if we suppose that owing to Dante's continued and studious concealment of his love, together with the extreme rareness of the occasions on which he and Beatrice had ever met, even in the street—never apparently elsewhere; at any rate they had never spoken since their first meeting at the ages of nine and eight—the result, and indeed the natural result, had been that Beatrice herself was wholly unaware of Dante's devotion to her. If she were thus ignorant, her conduct to him at the wedding ceases to wear that unfeeling and even heartless character to which so much exception has been taken. It may have been inconsiderate, unsympathetic, somewhat thoughtless; but, after all, is this inconceivable in a girl of nineteen or twenty on the occasion of a marriage, and perhaps her own marriage, feast? Such a flaw would rather seem to be an indication of the reality of the narrative in which it occurs, on much the same principle as the well-known *difficilior lectio* in criticism.*

But it is now time, and more than time, to turn to the positive arguments on which the theory of the Realists, in the sense and degree in which that term has already been explained, relies, and unfortunately the space at our disposal allows no more than a very rapid indication of them. And first, we naturally turn to the positive external evidence. We may not lay much stress on the fact that the author of the 'Ottimo Comento,' himself, as he tells us more than once, personally known to Dante, and writing in 1333 or 1334, though not mentioning Beatrice's family name, twice distinctly asserts her literal existence, and Dante's literal, though entirely pure devotion to her ('ch' egli amò con pura 'benivolenza'). Nor can we venture to adduce the very definite statement in the recently discovered recension (of doubtful genuineness) of Peter Dante's Commentary among the Ashburnham MSS. For practical purposes the external evidence for the identification of the Beatrice of Dante with Beatrice Portinari is limited to the sole authority of

* It is amusing to contrast the following very characteristic French view of Beatrice with the varied forms of German and Italian scepticism which the symbolical and ideal theories have brought before us: 'Malgré son jeune âge, sa figure avait une expression sereine de candeur, une grace naïve et sérieuse à la fois, quelque chose de grave et de l'idéal dans la forme de l'ovale, qui expliquent, si c'est possible, l'émotion soudaine de Dante'! (Drouilhet, quoted by Renier, p. 154.)

Boccaccio's statement to that effect. It is true that he wrote this about forty or fifty years after Dante's death, and it must further be allowed that he was both an uncritical and imaginative writer. But, as has been argued before now, he was himself nine years old when Dante died; he knew intimately several of Dante's actual relations and closest personal friends, whom he mentions by name, as well as at least one very near relation of Beatrice herself. So that he certainly had considerable opportunities for knowing the true facts, if he had the will to record them. Next, it is important to remember that he made this very definite statement in his lectures to a Florentine audience, that it affected two very well-known contemporary Florentine families, the Bardi having even a European reputation. Among his audience were probably some members, connexions, and friends of both these families, certainly many who were quite able to expose the falseness of Boccaccio's statement, if it were false. And if, as it has been urged in reply to this, the members of both the families concerned would be only too well pleased to let the complimentary fiction pass unchallenged, there would certainly be plenty of others, without any motive for such a conspiracy of silence, before whom Boccaccio would not have dared thus to offer himself to ridicule and exposure. Moreover, if Boccaccio were inventing, why did he invent the gratuitous improbability of making Beatrice a married woman, which is nowhere hinted at by Dante, and, moreover, the wife of a member of one of the most prominent families of Florence? We should surely require some very strong reasons to the contrary before summarily rejecting a statement of such a kind, and made under such circumstances.

Secondly. The following considerations may be urged in favour of the substantially real and historical character of the Beatrice of Dante, though, of course, as to her identity with Beatrice Portinari in particular we can never hope to add anything to the slender external evidence already adduced.

It would, we maintain, be an utter anachronism to suppose in Dante, or other writers of that age, an allegory constructed without a basis of fact. Their poetic nature would have abhorred such a vacuum. No less anomalous for us nowadays would be the converse process of seriously attaching an allegorical meaning and purpose to the facts occurring, and persons met with, in our own daily lives, though such a habit was as natural to the poetic and other

serious and thoughtful minds of that age as the use of metaphor to an Oriental writer. In this way they thought that they 'saw into the heart of things,' just as Wordsworth felt in regard to the most ordinary sights and operations in the natural world. At present, however, our main point is to insist that this habit of mind which thus saw 'all things double one against the other,' demanded as a sort of axiom—an axiom not only poetical, but we might almost say psychological—that all allegory should rest on a basis of literal fact; that, as a recent writer has expressed it, however ready they were to soar into the air, the first impulse for the flight must be given by a spring from the solid earth. Dante himself, in Conv. i. 1, 13, &c., has insisted on this most emphatically. 'The literal meaning 'must always come first; it is that in which all the other 'meanings are included; without it it would be impossible 'and irrational to understand the others; and *above all for* '*the allegorical it is impossible.*' This is emphatically repeated no less than four times over in this chapter. See, again, very strong language to this effect, which we have not space to quote, in 'Vita Nuova,' ch. xxv. The answer commonly given to this, as e.g. by Renier, is that this means 'non reale della vita; basta che sia reale del pen-'siero;' or, again, 'reale pensato non realtà delle cose;' and we are referred to the fact that Dante himself makes allegorical use of Cerberus, Geryon, Antæus, &c., to whom he would not attribute historical reality. So far true. Certainly Dante does not mean that we must never employ a person or event for allegorical purposes, unless we are prepared to defend against all comers their historical reality. But he means much the same as Aristotle means when he says (in Poet. ix. 6) that tragedians *τῶν γενομένων ὀνομάτων ἀντέχονται*, as contrasted with the purely fictitious nature of the characters in the 'Flower' of Agathon. From this point of view Œdipus or Prometheus will fulfil the necessary conditions, quite as well as Julius Cæsar or Henry V. They have a recognised existence, it matters not whether mythical or historical, *outside the poet's brain.* If he were to invent the persons and events on which the allegory was founded, as well as the allegory itself, in himself he might perhaps speak mysteries, but others would not be edified. Dante would, as we believe, regard such an enterprise not only as a poetical monstrosity, not only as a desperate effort to 'make bricks without straw,' but as an absurdity more aptly illustrated by a man's attempting to

'raise himself by his own waistband.' It is true that allegory, as well as tragedy, has long since outgrown its original limitations. Modern tragedy is no longer restricted to γενόμενα ὀνόματα,

> 'To Atreus or to Pelops' line,
> Or some tale of Troy divine.'

So, also, allegory may now be constructed with characters wholly fictitious—a process with which Bunyan, as well as many succeeding writers, have made us familiar. But, again and again it must be urged, the nineteenth century is not the fourteenth; and we must not assume, in the teeth of direct evidence to the contrary, that earlier writers in this field would thus have attempted

> 'to give to airy nothing
> A local habitation and a name.'

Thirdly. We would appeal to Dante's own practice of applying allegory to other persons, undoubtedly historical, in such a manner as to transform and transfigure them and their actions quite as widely from the reality of fact as anything of this kind that can be adduced in the case of Beatrice. The briefest references must suffice. Let us remember, first, the astounding language applied to Cato, both in the 'Divina Commedia' and the 'Convito,' especially iv. 28; the surprising allegory developed out of the story of the three Maries and their visit to the sepulchre in Conv. iv. 22; the mystical significance of the planets in Conv. B. ii. 14; the idealisation or allegorisation of Virgil, Leah, Rachel, and Matilda, whoever she may be; for however much that is disputed, no one, we believe, doubts that she is historical. The only possible or apparent exception that occurs to us is the nameless 'donna gentile,' who typified to Dante Philosophy, as he distinctly asserts in the 'Convito.' The controversy as to the 'donna gentile' is only second in magnitude to that about Beatrice; but it is not to be assumed, nor do we for a moment believe, that she is any exception to Dante's usual practice. If she be Philosophy, and nothing else but Philosophy, one would like to know, as Carducci says, why (in 'Vita Nuova,' ch. xxxvi.) Philosophy should be represented as looking down at young men from an upper window?

Fourthly. It may be argued that, apart from any abstract theories about allegory and its proper basis, Dante, in the idealisation, allegorisation—may we not almost say, apotheosis?—of an existing woman, is but following the custom—

but with what an impassable interval!—of other poets of that age. Here, again, the brevity with which this point must be touched will perhaps expose us to the objection of arguing *ignotum per ignotius*, or of assuming a disputed point which we ought to prove; and it will not have been forgotten that a counter-assertion as to the practice of these poets figured among the arguments of the Idealists. It will of course be said, as indeed it has been said, that perhaps Selvaggia, Giovanna, Fiammetta, and even Laura, are all fictitious together. Unfortunately we cannot stop to argue this. One or two words, however, as to Giovanna and Laura. If Giovanna were a fiction, what is the point of accusing Guido of having transferred his affections from this fiction to another fiction called Mandetta? And as to Laura such scepticism is simply absurd, since her existence is as certain as anything in history, and her family survives near Avignon to this day. Space, however, compels us now to limit ourselves to the bare assertion that, as in the later case of Petrarch, where facts are indisputable, so also in the earlier cases of the poets of the Siculo-Provençal and Bolognese schools, those who are most familiar with that literature find it impossible to disbelieve or doubt that in each instance (as in the very similar case of knightly service) the poet's inspiration was derived from the 'cult' of some real person. There is no doubt, at any rate in several cases, as to the reality of the person, whatever may be thought as to the reality of the 'cult.' And so in Dante's 'cult' of Beatrice Portinari, and his resolve, in the true spirit and language of the chivalrous or troubadour poet, 'dire di lei quello che mai non fu detto di alcuna,' he was but the Homer of a cyclic group, although, like him, 'sopra 'gli altri com' aquila vola.'

Fifthly. We must call attention once more to the multitude of realistic details, purporting to be facts, recorded by Dante of Beatrice, some of them minute and almost trivial, many of them such as do not lend themselves to any allegorical purpose that can with any show of plausibility be suggested, some of them even repugnant to any such purpose—by which we mean that they are not only inexplicable, but also so inappropriate and unideal that one cannot conceive any reason for their being set down except that they actually occurred. Let us rapidly enumerate, without any classification or comment, some of these incidents. The precise statements as to the death of Beatrice, her exact age at her death, the actual date—day, month, and year—

of her death, the death of one of her friends, the death of her father—this corresponding, be it observed, exactly with the known date of the death of Folco Portinari, which took place a few months before the date given by Dante as that of Beatrice's death, as has been already mentioned. There is also the definite statement that she was 'one of the 'Christians of the thirteenth century.' Dante's own sorrow was real and literal; it affected his health, his appearance, his eyesight, the actual symptoms and remedies of the last-named injury being minutely described.* These and other similar difficulties appear, even in proportion to their difficulty, to be arguments in favour of their real occurrence, on the principle which has been already indicated. Nor must we forget the very precise language of Purg. xxx. and xxxi. as to the literal death of Beatrice, and how she was literally buried, and her 'flesh saw corruption.'

Sixthly. We have one or two external testimonies not to be overlooked. There is the beautiful canzone of Cino da Pistoia, one of Dante's most intimate friends, beginning 'Avvegna ched' io m' aggio più per tempo,' in which he administers to him consolation when crushed with sorrow at the death of Beatrice, in language of the most touching and apparently deeply felt sympathy. It is difficult to suppose that anyone could read this without being convinced that the feelings on both sides are real, genuine, and heartfelt; or could suppose that this exquisite composition is nothing but an academic exercise on an artificial thesis.

It remains to say a few words on the recently suggested modification of the Realist theory, which we have above described as the 'Separatist' view, viz. that Beatrice was a real person certainly, but as certainly *not* Beatrice Portinari. Most of the arguments which we have hitherto adduced tend to support the Realist hypothesis generally, but not to discriminate between these two forms of it. But in favour of the older view we have—first, the direct statement of Boccaccio, given, as we have maintained, under conditions that afford a considerable guarantee for its credibility, but as to the value of which the most widely different opinions are nevertheless held. Next, we have at least one definite point of contact, already pointed out, between the details given by Dante and known facts concerning the Portinari family. So that we have at any rate some *point d'appui* for the ordinary theory, which at least entitles us to say that the

* See Vita Nuova, ch. xxiii. and xl.; and Conv. iii. 9.

'burden of proof' lies with its opponents. They are surely bound to show that the statement of Boccaccio is improbable to the verge of incredibility. If not, Beatrice Portinari at least 'holds the field,' and, moreover, she is at any rate a definite known historic personality, whereas her modernly devised and unsubstantial rival is as difficult to attack as Milton's angels, since she is admittedly wholly unknown and unknowable.

We conclude with two general observations.

1. It is to be noted that the Realists do not for a moment deny the truth of the Symbolist, much less of the Idealist, theories. It is fully admitted that both not only may be true, but that they certainly do contain very large elements of truth. Speaking of their general principles, not of all the applications in detail, their advocates, as is so often the case in controversy, are right in most of what they affirm, and only, or chiefly, wrong in what they deny. In their assertions there is very much truth, but it is not, as they maintain, the whole truth. We only contend that side by side with these theories, and as a necessary basis for them, some form of the Realist theory must also be held.

2. *Every* theory has its difficulties; we are very far from pretending that all is clear and straightforward on the Realist theory. It is a most extraordinary fact that Dante has so written that no one, either near his own time or for six hundred years since, has ever been able to give one clear and consistent explanation of his meaning. No one has ever yet been able so to enter into his frame of mind, so to see things with his eyes, as to make his thoughts and language appear natural, or even consistently intelligible. We can scarcely hope that, as we move further and further away from the scenes and thoughts, the mental, social, political, religious environment in which he moved, that that supreme point of view will ever now be reached. It is then for us a choice of difficulties, but in that case we must endeavour to move along 'the line of least resistance,' and that we venture unhesitatingly to assert is found in the admission of an historical Beatrice, the circumstances and incidents of whose life were substantially and in the main such as Dante has recorded in the 'Vita Nuova.' On any other supposition than that of 'realism,' in some form, we have to face difficulties and to swallow improbabilities which run counter to reason itself, sometimes conflicting with historically established facts, and sometimes with such fundamental principles of experience and common sense as we cannot suppose to be modified by time or place.

ART. IV.—1. *History of Phœnicia.* By G. RAWLINSON, M.A. London: 1889.

2. *Carthage and the Carthaginians.* By R. BOSWORTH SMITH. London: 1878.

3. *History of Art in Phœnicia.* By G. PERROT and CH. CHIPIEZ. English Translation. London: 1885.

4. *Phœnicia.* By J. KENRICK, M.A. London: 1855.

AMONG ancient races of the Levantine shores none present as much to interest a seafaring people, like ourselves, as the ancient trading people of the Syrian coast, known to Greeks and Egyptians as the Phœnicians. They were the first to explore the treacherous shores of the mutable Mediterranean, to sail round Africa, to dare the billows of the Bay of Biscay, and even to enter the mouth of the English Channel. For nearly a thousand years they were supreme at sea, and their conquests—more durable than the warlike raids of the stronger inland races—were peaceful and commercial. As traders and carriers they made themselves useful and necessary to the wilder Aryan and African tribes, and in the character of their relations to other peoples they greatly resembled the English. Inhabitants of a narrow and stormy coast, with small military but supreme naval power, they became rich, while Continental peoples were wasted by endless war, and built up new civilised states while others were destroying the civilisation of their rivals. Perhaps too from the fall of their power some lesson may still be learned by those who have imitated their earlier history and who suffer from like political evils.

The Phœnicians, properly so called, were a Semitic race. In dress, in manners, in religion, in speech, and in physical type they approached more nearly to their Hebrew cousins than did any other people. Canon Rawlinson has carefully distinguished them from the Canaanite race which preceded them on the Syrian coast, and which probably long survived their immigration from the shores of the Persian Gulf, which is attested not only by the consensus of historical traditions, but by the evidence of their monumental art and the Babylonian affinities of their civilisation in its earlier days. Their geographical position and the character of their coasts may have been among the first causes of their seafaring tendencies; but it was among the creeks and islets of the Persian Gulf, and on the lower waters of the Tigris

and the Euphrates, that they seem first to have learned navigation. Powerful and warlike tribes and steep, rugged mountains shut them in on the east; and on the west in the bright winter days they might see, from the slopes of Lebanon, the snowy range of the Troados gleaming on the horizon of the glassy sea. Long reefs of limestone run out from the shallow sandy bays of the Phœnician coast, forming small natural harbours, which were made, with little trouble, safe ports even in winter. The Mediterranean was tideless, and the ports might be entered at any hour. The long ranges of Lebanon, rising from the red sandstone to the grey limestone, and to the snow which melts only in the middle of summer, afforded a climate fit for every season of the year, and an invigorating air which still renders the Lebanon Maronites one of the hardiest and most independent of Levantine populations. Sand for glass, clay for the potter, cedar and fir, mines of lead, copper, and iron, and even perhaps of tin, were close at hand to the cities on the shore; and the knowledge of the arts necessary for commerce had been long learned from the civilised Turanians of Chaldea. Lebanon too is the home of the grape, swelled by the soft mists which daily cover the higher ridges at noon, and ripened by the hot sun reflected from its rocks. In the valleys the olive flourishes, and on the coasts, where frost is never felt, the date palm grows in the sand beside the rivers. On the south the lower and harbourless coast of Palestine, on the north the more rugged and barren shores of Asia Minor, presented fewer natural advantages. The Phœnicians enjoyed the pick of the land, and the great archipelago of the wind-swept rocky islands to the north-west tempted the Phœnician mariner from point to point till the grand Gulf of Smyrna was reached, and thence the shores of Greece, the narrow Hellespont, and even the stormy waters of the Black Sea, where later Phœnician colonies were founded.

The ships in which these adventurous first voyages were made appear to have been of very small size, and much resembled those used later by the Greeks and Romans, who, perhaps, first copied Phœnician biremes. The Phœnician ports were all very small. That of Sidon covers only twenty acres, while the two famous harbours of Tyre—the Sidonian to the north and the Egyptian to the south—were each only about twelve acres in area; yet these were among the most important on the coast. The ships were broad and tub-like, with a single movable mast, fitted with a square

sail, and having one or two banks of oars, with from fifteen to twenty-five rowers on either side, or sometimes even not more than ten. They were steered, not by a single rudder, but by two great sweeps at the stern—a method which was common to other ancient nations, and which still (as Sir Henry Yule has shown) was usual even to the thirteenth century A.D. in the East, the single rudder being as yet uncommon. At the prow was placed the figure-head, or pigmy statue of the *pataichos*, the guardian genius of the ship and the forefather of our modern figure-heads. On each side of the bows was painted, as in Egypt, the sacred eye, which may still be seen on Neapolitan fisher-boats and Burmese galleys. Yet, small and heavy as these ships always were, a steady rate of progress of not less than a hundred miles in the twenty-four hours was attained; for the Phœnicians steered by the Pole star and did not find it necessary to anchor at night. When the winds were contrary the course was still maintained by steady, and no doubt most laborious, rowing. How many such galleys perished in winter storms before the far-distant Tin Islands and the Gold Coast were reached we know not; but the fear of the sea, which finds expression in Hebrew hymns and in Homeric poems, never daunted the hearts of the Phœnicians.

The first island reached was Cyprus, where naturally the chief colonies were on the south and east. Even Herodotus, when he speaks of the 'long voyages' of the Phœnicians from Tyre, is only referring to their appearance, bearing Egyptian and Assyrian exports, in Argos and on other Greek coasts. Very early, however, they crept down the shore to Egypt, and settled in the Delta before 1600 B.C. From the Nile they first probably reached the Libyan coasts, founding Carthage about 850 B.C. Italy is by some believed to have been colonised even earlier by the Tyrians, though the evidence cannot be said to be very strong. That Spain was reached in Solomon's days is scarcely credible, and the assertion rests on a very doubtful basis. To the Greeks in the time when the 'Odyssey' was written both Italy and Libya were fairy lands, full of marvels—of giants, cannibals, enchantresses, monsters, and immortals. Yet the Greeks had already, for some four centuries, been intimate with Phœnician sailors.

Whatever be the truth as to these earlier voyages to the West, the daring of the Phœnicians had, by 600 B.C., so much increased that they succeeded in circumnavigating the

whole African coast. Of the truth of Herodotus's account of this enterprise we can hardly entertain any suspicion, since what appeared to him most incredible in this story is to us its surest confirmation. The passage is of great importance and runs as follows:—

'The Phœnicians' (in the reign of Necho), 'setting out therefore from the Red Sea, navigated the Southern Sea. When autumn came they went ashore and sowed the land, by whatever part of Libya they happened to be sailing, and waited for harvest: then, having reaped the corn, they put to sea again. When two years had thus passed, in the third, having doubled the Pillars of Hercules, they arrived in Egypt; and it was related to me, which does not seem credible, but may to others, that as they sailed round Libya they had the sun on their right hand. Thus Libya was first known. The Carthaginians subsequently say that Libya is surrounded by water.'*

So faithfully has the great Greek set down a fact which, as he had never passed the Equator, was to him incredible. That a voyage which might now occupy some two months should be accomplished in three years—including even a third of each for the corn-growing—is not only credible, but agrees with the known rate of Phœnician sailing. From Rome to Carthage, a distance of about 350 miles, was counted three days' sail by Cato. The Norman ships in the twelfth century A.D. accomplished the voyage from Marseilles to Acre in 18 days—a distance of 1,900 miles—in ships very like those of the Phœnicians. The length of the voyage round Libya was some 15,000 miles, and the whole might therefore easily be accomplished in the time stated. The Egyptians, nearly a thousand years earlier, had ventured by sea as far as Somali Land, and in the second century of our era the Arabs were busy coasting as far south as the Zambesi, which they ascended in search of gold, leaving behind them, north of the Transvaal, those ancient stone forts which the Portuguese ascribed to Solomon. Thus, as Canon Rawlinson briefly remarks, 'entering the Southern 'Ocean [the Phœnicians] succeeded in doubling the Cape of 'Storms 2,000 years before Vasco di Gama.'

A century later the Carthaginian Hanno made his adventurous voyage to the Gold-Coast, of which a brief account has come down to us, with details full of interest. About 500 B.C. he set out with sixty ships of fifty oars each, and passed by Gibraltar to a distance equal to that traversed from Carthage, arriving at the Isle of Cerne, which, from

* Herod. iv. 42.

the measurement, appears to have been one of the Canaries. The further voyage extended beyond Cape Verde and Cape Palmas to the seventh degree of north latitude. Here, anticipating Du Chaillu, the Carthaginians captured *gorillæ*, which they imagined to be human; but finding even the females untameable, they killed them and brought home the skins, when their return was made necessary by failing provisions.

Such feats having been performed in the Atlantic, and by the ever stormy shores of the Cape of Good Hope, it appears but a minor achievement that, from the Carthaginian colony of Cadiz, the galleys should have coasted through the Bay of Biscay to our own islands. The Kassiterides, or 'Tin Islands,' of which Herodotus had heard, were long monopolised by the Punic traders. The secret of their position was jealously kept, and Strabo (III. v. 11) speaks of a Phœnician captain who, followed by a Roman galley on the west coast of Spain, steered on a shoal, and so misled and wrecked the Roman ship as well as his own—yet was compensated at home for his loss, on account of his patriotism. The Kassiterides were only vaguely known to Herodotus; and Canon Rawlinson, in accepting the Roman identification with the Sillinæ, or Scilly Isles, is silent on the difficulty that neither tin nor remains of mines are found in these islets. The tin, whence the name Kassiterides was derived, must have come from Cornwall, where Cæsar knew of its existence. It might, of course, have been carried to the Scillys by native traders, but it is possible that Cornwall itself was visited itself by the Punic merchants. The Kassiterides must have been reached before 400 B.C., and it seems very doubtful if the value of tin would have been known so early to the Britons, until instructed by the merchants, who gave rude pottery and other cheap wares in its stead, much as the modern trader deals for ivory. Some have thought that the tin was brought in coracles to the French coast; and Diodorus (v. 22) speaks of an overland route to Marseilles in Cæsar's time. Strabo describes the natives of the Tin Islands as pastoral wanderers, with beards like goats and black robes; but Diodorus says that the Cornish men were civilised and fond of strangers. Whether Cornwall or the Scillys were the trading depôts, there is at least no evidence that the Phœnicians ever explored the Baltic or the Irish Channel, and no Phœnician text has been found farther north than Marseilles. On the other hand, the peculiar stone used for celts, found in the

dolmen chambers of Guernsey, is not known to exist nearer than Spain; and it is possible that some of these celts, which seem to show a knowledge of metal—which was unknown to the flat-headed fish-eaters of the Channel Islands—may have been manufactured for the savage trade by the Punic merchants of Cadiz. In Strabo's time the exports from Great Britain consisted of gold, iron, silver, cattle, skins, fleeces, and dogs; while the imports were of ivory, with gold chains, amber cups, drinking-glasses, and bridles for horses. Cæsar obtained his first ideas of England from traders, who were already passing regularly across the Channel. The beginnings of English trade with the Phœnicians seem thus to be traceable back to the days of Herodotus; but nothing is known of any Phœnician settlement in Britain, which was to the Punic traders what the most remote islands of the Southern Ocean have become to ourselves.

Canon Rawlinson has prudently discarded the theories which would place Ophir—explored by Hebrews and Phœnicians in Solomon's time—either in Ceylon, India, Burmah, or on the Upper Zambesi. The Book of Genesis (x. 29) places Ophir in Southern Arabia, and Yemen was still rich in gold in the second century A.D. The fact that the elephants' teeth, apes, and peacocks brought to Solomon bear, in Hebrew, names used in Indian languages proves little. The same words were used in Egypt and in Assyria, as well as by Greeks and Romans, for the ape and elephant. The Assyrian overland trade with India was (as proved by monumental evidence) as old at least as the ninth century B.C., and Ophir may have been the meeting-place of the Phœnician merchants, and of the Indian traders coasting from the mouths of the Indus. It is to be regretted, however, that, while supporting the better established view as to Ophir, Canon Rawlinson still adheres to the unfortunate identification of Tarshish with the region of Tartessus in Spain. Tarshish is enumerated in Genesis (x. 4) with places on the coasts of Asia Minor, and there can be little doubt that the Phœnician colony of Tarsus is to be understood—a town which was still a port in Cleopatra's time, though the river has since then (as in so many other known cases) formed a foreshore which cuts off the site from the sea. If in the much disputed passage (1 Kings x. 22) which speaks of the 'navy of Tarshish' we are to understand that ivory, apes, and peacocks came from that town, it is more natural to suppose that they were brought overland by the Assyrian

traders than that they were found in Spain or in Libya, where they would probably not have borne the names known in India. It is very doubtful if any early traders but the Carthaginians and the later Greeks reached Spain. The Samians claimed to have been the first to pass the Pillars of Hercules, and tin, which was very early a Phœnician trading commodity, is not abundant in Spanish mines. Strabo and Diodorus are late authorities, and may refer to Punic rather than to Tyrian explorers when they relate the dogged determination whereby, after two disastrous expeditions, the Straits of Gibraltar were passed and Cadiz founded. Tin was used in Egypt and in the Levant at a very early historic period. It was known to the Akkadians about 2500 B.C. by a different name from that used by the Phœnicians, and which was adopted by the Greeks. Recent researches point to the Caucasus or to the Altai Mountains as the original source of tin, before the discovery of the Cornish mines on the west and of Indian tin on the east.

A few words may be here devoted to the interesting question of the early knowledge of those metals in which the Phœnicians traded, but which they were not the only people to carry to the Aryans. The question has of late received much serious study, with the result that other sources of supply have been discovered, apparently independent of Phœnician trade. Gold was no doubt brought to Greece by Semitic traders, and the Greek word *χρυσός* is probably derived from either the Phœnician or the Assyrian language. But the Aryans had very early a native word meaning the 'yellow metal,' which is recognisable in the Phrygian *γλουρός*. The Greeks too and other Aryans had native names for silver. For copper the Phœnician name never was used by their customers, though the Æs Cyprium seems to have taken its name from Cyprus.* The Latins had a much older name for the metal—*raudus*, the Akkadian *urud* and Basque *uraida*. It would seem that the Turanians and Aryans had, therefore, an independent knowledge of copper, and even of tin; for though Phœnicians, Assyrians, and Akkadians used for this metal the same word which occurs in the 'Iliad' as *κασσίτερος* and in Sanskrit as *Kastíra*—in Arabic *Kasdir*—yet there was in Greek another word, *ἐανός*, which is connected with the Akkadian *anna*, Armenian *anag*, and Hungarian *on* for 'tin,' and which does not appear in Semitic speech. Iron, which was little used in the times of the Homeric poems, is nevertheless in the 'Odyssey' represented as brought in shiploads from the islands of the Ionian Sea, to be ex-

changed for copper in the south of Italy. The Akkadians knew iron by its Mongol name (*dimirsa* or *timirti*, 'the strong' metal), and lead, which the ancients often confused with tin, was very early used in Asia Minor, as Dr. Schliemann's excavations have proved, but was not called by a Semitic name among Aryans. The Punic traders found rich mines of lead in Spain, but the Akkadians knew the metal much earlier. As regards bronze, which was extensively used all over the ancient world from the earliest historic times, the recent discoveries in Egypt show that it was not known in the time of the sixth dynasty, while under the twelfth a very small proportion of tin (·52 per cent.) is found in the copper, and as time passed the proportion rose to 6 or 7 per cent. under the eighteenth dynasty, while in Assyria and at Tello the same gradual transition from pure copper to bronze is observable between 2500 and 700 B.C. At the later date under Sargon 10 per cent. of tin was added to the copper. The ancient objects discovered at Troy range in like manner from the old copper pins and nails to the latest bronze battle axes with 9 per cent. of tin. In the Lebanon gold and silver were found in very small quantities, but iron was more abundant. Copper was obtained in quantity in Cyprus, but the existence of tin is doubtful on the Phœnician coasts. In Thasos Herodotus admired the great mines of the Phœnician gold diggers, but the Egyptian copper mines in Sinai were immensely older.

These various facts seem to show that, although the Mediterranean nations owed much of their metal to Phœnician traders, yet the latter were but the inheritors of the older civilisations of Chaldea and Egypt, and that the Greeks were in direct communication with the traders of Mesopotamia, by the overland route through Asia Minor, as well as with the Tyrian and Sidonian sailors.

Ivory and purple, with cedar and the aromatic woods and canes of the far East, were also objects of Phœnician trade. For the tin, lead, and hides of Britain the traders gave in exchange pottery, salt, bronze, arms, and implements, and cooking or table utensils.* The ivory may have been African, but there is some evidence that in early historic times the Asiatic elephant ranged much further west than it now does. As regards the celebrated Tyrian purple, and as regards the metallurgy of Spain, the interesting and detailed accounts collected by Canon Rawlinson give

* Strabo, III. v. 11.

full information. The manufacture of glass, which the ancients attributed to the Phœnicians, has, however, as he points out, been proved by existing pictures to have been of great antiquity in Egypt.

The scope of Canon Rawlinson's volume does not include Carthaginian antiquities, perhaps because these have already been made the subject of another work. Yet there is no epoch of the history of the race which can compare with that of Hannibal's invasion of Italy, and no figure which can compare with that of the great soldier genius of Carthage, whose failure was so soon followed by the downfall of the Phœnician power at sea.

By the year 260 B.C. Rome was the mistress of Southern Italy, but the Carthaginians, with their fleet of quinqueremes armed with iron-spiked prows, held the islands. In the first contests with the inferior Roman ships Duilius conquered by tackling and boarding the enemy's galleys by drawbridges from the bows. Regulus had 130 sail when he landed on the African coast. But Carthage had another powerful resource in the elephants, which trampled down the Roman legions. It is remarkable that the African elephant, now considered untameable, should have been trained for war by the Punic colonists of Libya. The struggle between Rome and Carthage was a fight for the maritime supremacy, and a national navy of 200 ships was created by the public subscription of Roman traders, when the Senate was discouraged by the disasters on land. This navy wrought havoc with the Punic fleet in the Italian seas.

In 241 B.C. Rome had succeeded in wresting from Carthage a treaty whereby Sicily and the adjacent islands were given up, and an indemnity of nearly 800,000*l.* paid, with the release of all the Roman captives. Mutinies among the Punic mercenaries soon followed, and Sardinia was lost. Thus for a quarter of a century the final struggle was postponed by the internal dissensions of Carthage.

It was, perhaps, on account of failing power at sea that the bold design of marching a thousand miles by land, from Spain to Apulia, was conceived. In 218 A.D. the great march commenced. With 90,000 foot, 12,000 horse, and fifty elephants, Hannibal ('the man whom Baal favoured') set forth along the east coast of Spain, crossing the Ebro and turning the Pyrenees near the Mediterranean shore. So rapid and so little opposed was the advance that, although Scipio, ordered to Spain, hastened instead to Marseilles, Hannibal had floated his army across the river at Avignon

before he could advance to dispute the passage. The Gauls were surrounded by the African cavalry, and in the early part of September the Punic army crossed the St. Bernard Pass—yet with a loss so far of two-thirds of the infantry, half the cavalry, and all the elephants but one. The whole march had occupied only four months, and the Marseilles tablet, which dates, perhaps, rather earlier than this time, shows us that a Phœnician colony, with a regular priesthood, was there established, and suggests that aid may have been given on the route by the Punic settlers, with whom the Gauls were more familiar as yet than with the Romans.

Hannibal was thus master of Northern Italy, and after the winter descended the basin of the Arno. His design was not to attack Rome, but to form in Apulia a secure base for his flying column, and to open up communication with Carthage by sea. The Roman armies were scattered—one in Spain, the other in Sicily. The South Italians, jealous of the rising power of the Romans, sided with Carthage. The delay with which the great general is charged was due rather to political considerations than to any failure of military enterprise. Apulia was rich in corn and grass, and had support been given to him at home the destinies of Rome would have perhaps been far other than they were. At Cannæ, in 216 B.C., the home army of the Romans was destroyed, and the capital appeared to be at Hannibal's mercy. But when Mago, his brother, reported these victories in Carthage — where Hannibal had few personal friends, having followed his father, Hamilcar, to Spain when only nine years old—he met with a cold reception, and only 4,000 horse and forty elephants were granted to aid a struggle vital to the Punic prosperity.

Still more disgraceful was the departure of the Carthaginian fleet from Syracuse, when the land force, decimated by marsh fever, was endeavouring to aid the revolution stirred up by Hannibal, and to defeat the besieging forces of Marcellus, who retook the city in 212 B.C. Gradually forced back to the toe of the Italian boot, Hannibal awaited further reinforcements of his diminished army. In the winter of 208 B.C. his brother Hasdrubal had reached Gaul, and ten years after the famous original passage of the Alps he too crossed the St. Bernard; but it was now too late: Rome had rallied her forces, and the first news of the gallant but disastrous attempt to aid him was given when the bloody head of his brother—slain at Sena—was tossed into Hannibal's lines.

For six and thirty years Hannibal had not seen Carthage, for sixteen he had fought and marched unaided, for ten he had held and offered to his country a base of operations, reached with unsurpassed daring, in Southern Italy. He was ordered home, but the forces he had now to command, including even the sad remnants of his veterans, were annihilated by Scipio at Sicca. The treaty which followed deprived Carthage of its army, its elephants, and all its fleet save ten triremes, and made Rome the suzerain in Africa, with an annual tribute of 48,000*l.* for fifty years. The close of the hero's career, when, after vainly striving to serve his country against the old enemy in Syria, he poisoned himself in his Bithynian exile at the age of sixty-one, was the sequel of a life of struggles for an ungrateful republic. But Carthage soon rued the short-sighted jealousies of its factions. 'Delenda est Carthago' became the popular cry of a people bent on ruling the Mediterranean. In 146 B.C. the fated city was razed to the ground, and the curse on its ruins which Scipio pronounced rendered them desolate until the days of the Cæsars. Faction, jealousy, the absence of the old monarchical constitution under which their ancestors had thriven at Tyre and Sidon, sufficiently account for the want of support which a single wise and patriotic statesman would infallibly have given to the hero of the nation. The rich advocated submission to Rome, the mob cried out for war; the councils of the popular assembly wavered and constantly changed, while Rome faithfully stood by her generals. It may be that Fabius, when he waited—as Wellington waited in face of slander and mistrust—calculated better than Hannibal what was to be expected of the many-headed, from whom the Punic hero took orders, when he should have been bidden to command. It is a lesson which should not be lost to a rich commercial nation, whose very life depends, as did that of Carthage, on ruling at sea. When Carthage fell it needed but three-quarters of a century for Rome, after putting down the pirates of the Mediterranean backed by Mithridates of Pontus, to plant her rule in Asia, and to subdue the original Phœnician fatherland. Vainly did the ladies of Carthage cut off their tresses for bowstrings when the wealthy and influential were cowards, the poor rebellious, and the statesmen of Africa swayed by popular clamour. Henceforth the riches of the East flowed by sea to Rome, and the power of the Semitic race was broken by the Aryans, who owed so much of their civilisation to Phœnician teaching.

The early history of a race so famous, and which so nearly attained to supremacy in Southern Europe, must always be of interest to those who would trace the causes of its prosperity. The monuments of Syria, Chaldea, and Egypt have of late years shed much new light on this subject, carrying back the Phœnician history beyond 1600 B.C. The pictures painted for Thothmes III. show us that the Phœnician physical type was Semitic—hook-nosed, black-haired with long beard and shaven upper lip, and bronzed complexion. The language of the monuments also shows that this Semitic race spoke a Semitic tongue. The judicious remarks of Canon Rawlinson on this question should be weighed carefully by those theorists who, tempted by the hasty assertions of the French anthropologist Broca, have endeavoured to dissociate the questions of language and race. The truth is that, from the dawn of history, neither a pure stock nor a language free from foreign influence is to be found anywhere in Egypt, Asia, or Europe; but, speaking broadly, the geographical distribution of the three main stocks remains in our own time almost unchanged from that which we trace 2,500 years before our era; and in the same broad sense language remains geographically coextensive with the original stocks to which it belonged. No race has ever willingly changed its mother tongue, and when new languages appear they accompany new and dominant races. 'Language,' says Canon Rawlinson, 'is at least a very strong evidence of ethnic character.' When Canon Isaac Taylor recently propounded the theory that the natives of Syria deserted their own speech for Greek, he showed a lamentable want of consideration of the history of the country.

But, while fully recognising the value of the scholarly sketch of the Phœnician language which Canon Rawlinson has given, a protest must be raised against his remarks as to the sounds of some of the letters. It may be unimportant that he should preserve the transliteration of the guttural *ain* by *ng*, which bears no relation whatever to the sound, which he has perhaps never heard pronounced by an Oriental; but the criticism on other letters is far more misleading.

'There was,' he says, 'in the alphabet, on the other hand, a certain amount of redundancy. *Tsade* is superfluous, since it represents not a simple elemental sound, but a combination of two sounds, *t* and *s* . . . There is redundancy in the two forms of *k*, namely, *kaph* and *koph*, in the two for *t*, namely, *teth* and *tau*, and in the two for *s*, namely, *samech* and *shin*.'

These remarks show that our author has never heard the true sounds pronounced by an Oriental. An Arab would say that our alphabet is redundant, because it possesses *p* and *b* sounds which he cannot distinguish, though the Turk and the Persian can. *Tsade* is only a *ts* in the mouths of Englishmen striving to pronounce the sound; the unfortunate Ephraimites could not distinguish *Samech* from *Shin* in 'Sibboleth,' the word propounded to them by the men of Gilead (Judges xii. 6), but this only proves that there was an audible distinction, as there is also very clearly between *Caph* and *Koph*, *Teth* and *Tau*. A race which so far simplified its alphabet as to use only twenty-two letters would not have retained or added one that was superfluous. Canon Rawlinson follows in the path of his Aryan ancestors, who never used the letters to which he objects, because they are superfluous in other Aryan as in English mouths, though of primary importance to the ear of Semitic races down to our own time.

As regards the origin and history of the Phœnician alphabet it is unnecessary here to say much. The subject has quite lately been treated at length in the pages of this Review; and Canon Rawlinson, while discarding the most recent discoveries, and falling back on the somewhat antiquated views of Gesenius, formed when the sources of information were as yet most incomplete, has added nothing new to the subject. It is sufficient here to note that the earliest Phœnician texts as yet known do not go back further than the ninth century B.C., and that the discoveries at Tell Amarna have shown that in the fifteenth century B.C. the Semitic governors of Phœnicia used the cuneiform character in writing. Some of the earlier texts are not mentioned by Canon Rawlinson, such as the bronze bowl dedicated by a Carthaginian to Baal Lebanon, and found in Cyprus, which, on account of the archaic form of the letters, may be older than 800 B.C. Nor does he mention the interesting text found in 1885 at Tyre, with the name of Azmelek—perhaps the same prince who withstood Alexander the Great—or the valuable text from near Acre found in the same year, bearing the date answering to 221 B.C., and throwing important light on the age of the famous coffin of Eshmunazar. The Greek texts from Phœnicia, belonging to the Roman period, might also well have been noted as showing that the Phœnician creed remained unchanged even after the diffusion of Christianity in the East. The alphabetic plates might have given us the earlier forms of the letters, in preference

to those of the Greek period. The diffusion of the Carthaginian alphabet in Numidia, where it was used in bilinguals (Numidian and Punic), and in the Canary Islands, and its appearance in a very degraded form on the coins of Africa and Spain as late as the third century A.D., are interesting questions, perhaps beyond the scope of his volume. Among the very first to use an alphabet, the Phœnician traders did more for the advancement of future literature than all the scribes of Egypt or Assyria ever accomplished by their pedantic refinements.

It may be remarked in passing that the origin of the name Phœnician or Punic is still unknown. The Greeks connected it with the 'palm' and the 'purple,' but the word is not a Semitic name of either. The Egyptians called these people the *Fenek*, and also the *Kaft*, as we know from the bilingual decree of Canopus. The *Kharu* were also certainly Phœnicians, but we do not as yet know what was the native name whereby the Phœnicians called themselves. Canaan, 'the lowlands,' was the term they applied to their coasts, not only in Palestine, but even as late as Justin's time in Africa. If *Fenek* be a Semitic word, its meaning would be 'the rich,' 'prosperous,' or 'luxurious,' but it does not occur in Phœnician texts, where men are generally described as natives of various cities—Tyre, Sidon, Carthage, Gebal, and others.

The earliest historic notice of the Phœnicians is in the time of Thothmes III. They appear even then not as warriors leagued with the Hittites to withstand him, but as artists whose bronze vases became a prey to the conqueror. 'A great cup, the work of the Kharu,' is mentioned, and from Cyprus came 'two tusks of ivory, forty bricks of iron, 'and one brick of lead.' The pictures show us how beautiful were already the forms of the Phœnician bronze vases, and represent gold *repoussé* work, and fanciful vessels in the shape of eagles' heads, with silver chalices having lids of gold. Syria was already a civilised country at this early period, and great stores of corn, wine, and oil were taken when Thothmes attacked Aradus and Simyra, in his advance to the Euphrates.

In the fifteenth century B.C. we learn from the Tell Amarna texts—to which Canon Rawlinson does not refer—that the cities of Tyre and Sidon, already important, were subject to Egypt, with Simyra, Megiddo, and Gaza; but very shortly after the decay of Egyptian power and the Hebrew invasion of Palestine rendered the Phœnicians in-

dependent, under petty princes ruling at each of their principal seaports. It is curious that Canon Rawlinson should regard 885 B.C. as the date when first the Phœnicians came in contact with the Assyrians, for Tiglath Pileser (in 1100 B.C.) states that he embarked on a ship of Aradus, in Phœnicia, and slew a dolphin in the Mediterranean. Nor is it correct to say that Egypt 'barred out the Phœnicians from expan-'sion on the south,' for we learn from an inscription of Rameses III. that their power had so enormously increased in the Delta before his time that about 1230 B.C. a Phœnician named Arisu or Haris ('the rising sun') actually sat on the throne of the Pharaohs. 'He raised himself to be a 'prince, and he compelled all the people to pay him tribute. 'Whatever any had gathered together, of that his companions 'robbed them. Thus they did: the gods they treated as 'they treated men; they lacked the sin offerings in the 'temples.' The Egyptian language even a century earlier bears witness to their power in the number of Semitic words incorporated into its vocabulary and in the names of Phœnician deities—Anta, Reseph, Marna, Baal, Ashtoreth, and perhaps Adonis and Tanith, who were added to the native pantheon.

The question of the Phœnician religion is also one of great importance in estimating their civilisation. The only source of information which can be considered safe is found in Phœnician inscriptions. The myths which, in common with the Assyrians and Chaldeans, they related, have come down to us only at third hand, from Sanchoniathon through Philo and Eusebius, and Canon Rawlinson is no doubt justified in considering them to be only available in a very corrupt form. Yet there is no doubt that legends of a paradise with its tree of life, of a flood, and of giants existed in Phœnicia, as well as in Mesopotamia, and fragments of these stories are preserved by Eusebius. The course of discovery has indeed long since refuted the hasty dictum of Renan that 'the Se-'mites have no mythology,' and the Greeks preserved the stories of Kadmus, Melkarth, Adonis, and Athamas, which are of Phœnician origin.

Archæology is as subject to fashion as any other literary study. Theories as to Phœnician religion range from that adopted by Canon Rawlinson, who believes that an original monotheism became corrupted into polytheism, down to the latest grotesque views of those who see the solution of all ancient beliefs in the formula 'totems and the matri-'archate,' and who represent these ancient civilisers of the

world as savages, adoring fetishes, believing themselves the descendants of pigs and dogs, and tracing descent from their mothers. Surely no more extravagant deduction was ever made from a forced comparison with Hottentots, Red Indians, and degraded Siberians than that which some theorists have in vain striven to establish by ignoring the monuments of Phœnicia and the accounts of ancient writers. No Phœnician text countenances any such views. Men trace their descent on the monuments from their fathers, and no mention of sacred animals or of *totem* names (as this school incorrectly call the Red Indian *otem*) is discoverable in any ancient text of Palestine or Phœnicia.

If, therefore, we would understand the Phœnician beliefs, the monuments must be our guide. They countenance neither of the theories above mentioned. The names or titles given to the gods, and their forms as represented on tablets and seals, are sufficient evidence of their supposed character.

On various texts we find the name *Alam* (the Hebrew Elohim) for 'the Almighty,' and *Allat* for the 'mighty god-'dess.' The name Baal never stands alone, save in personal compound names. Among the Baalim, or 'lords,' we find Baal Shemin, 'the lord of the heavens;' Baal Hamon, 'the 'lord of heat;' Baal Aphka, 'the lord of Aphek;' Baal Markod, and Baal Hanath. These, like most of the Phœnician titles for their deities, are peculiar to themselves and not found in Assyria. The lists of gods preserved in cuneiform tablets show that the Assyrians knew of this distinct nomenclature, and identified the various figures with those which bore different but equivalent titles in their own pantheon.

Ashtoreth (the Akkadian Istar, or 'god of light,' whose name retains its older form on the Moabite stone) had many titles, local or descriptive. She was called 'the manifesta-'tion of Baal, 'the name of Baal,' 'the glory of Baal,' 'the 'might of things living,' 'the pleasant,' 'the beautiful,' 'the 'lady of Gebal.' In Carthage she became Tanith, 'the cele-'brated;' Anath, 'she who answers;' Ama, 'the mother;' Boda, 'she who produces.' The compound Moloch-Ashtoreth is also found. The Greeks identified Tanith with Artemis, and Anath with Athene, but there is little doubt that the various Ashtoreths stood to one another in the same relation as the various Madonnas of Italy. She is represented with moon-shaped tire, generally naked, holding her breasts, grasping the sacred cake, or nursing an infant deity, just as

Istar is represented in Nineveh and Babylon. Many of the small pottery figures of Ashtoreth found in Cyprus are incredibly indecent, and the licentious worship peculiar to her continued to Constantine's days, and is said to be even now not quite extinct in Syria and at Mecca. Some statues said to be Phœnician represent the goddess in ths attitude of the Medici Venus, but these may, as will be noted later, be of Greek origin.

Next to Baal Hamon, the ram-horned sky god, and Moloch, the infernal deity, represented with a grinning mask, one of the most important gods was Reseph, 'the thunderer,' whom the Greeks likened to Apollo. He wears a stag's head on his tiara, and is called also Reseph Mical, 'the protector.' Milcom also was adored in Cyprus, and Melcarth, whose name is still of doubtful meaning, at Tyre and at Carthage, where the Greek bilinguals compare him to Dionysus. In his temple at Cadiz there was no statue, but two great obelisks and an ever burning fire. Women were excluded, and swine were hateful to the god, which can hardly be reconciled with Mr. Gladstone's theory that the population of Ithaca was Phœnician because Eumæus herded and ate swine. The name of Eshmun still lacks explanation, for the ordinary rendering, 'the eighth,' which Canon Rawlinson advocates, has not only an improbable meaning, but is also grammatically unsafe. Eshmun was the god of health—the Asclepios of the Greeks—perhaps the same as Baal Merpa, 'the lord of 'healing.' Other difficult names are frequently found, such as Tsid, Selek, Tsidik, Maryahi, and Sasam. Some of these may be non-Semitic, and in a later age, when, under the Ptolemies, Egypt had for a time re-established its influence in Phœnicia, we find Osiris, Horus, and Onca (the *ankh* or symbol of life) adored, while Nergal is invoked by a Phœnician merchant at Athens, under Assyrian influence.

Among the names of the sun god Adonis, Shamash, and Melcarth are the most usual. The non-Semitic name of Tammuz ('the sun spirit'), though known to the Hebrews, and attributed by early-writers to the Phœnicians, has not been found on any of their monuments. Zerah, 'the 'rising sun,' Marna, 'our Lord,' and Yereh, 'the moon,' also occur as titles of deities.

A seafaring nation may naturally be supposed to have adored a god of the sea. The Babylonians had such a god in Ea, who lived in the ocean and sailed in the sacred bark. A Phœnician gem shows us such a god in his ship, but bears no name. Dagon, worshipped in Philistia, and known

also, it would seem, in Phœnicia, is generally regarded as a sea god, represented half human, half a fish, just as Derceto at Ascalon is described as a mermaid. Canon Rawlinson disputes Gesenius's rendering of the name as 'the great fish,' and prefers to regard Dagon as the god of 'corn.' Schrader, who traces the name to Mesopotamia, on cuneiform texts, considers it to be non-Semitic. It should be noted, however, that we have many ancient representations of the merman god, one found in 1874 at Ashdod, on a well-carved gem. The name of Dagon is, however, absent from the monuments of Phœnicia.

The Phœnicians were in their religious rites not distinguished in any way from other ancient nations, who were their neighbours. Like the Greeks, they erected votive pillars in memory of prayers answered. At Carthage these constantly record that Melcarth and Tanith heard the voice of the suppliant, and were gracious towards him. One of the oldest Phœnician texts, that of Jehumelek, king of Gebal, prays to Baalath, the Lady of Gebal, 'because whensoever I 'have called upon her she hath heard my voice, and hath 'done me good. May Baalath of Gebal bless Jehumelek, 'and grant him life, and prolong his days and his years 'over Gebal, in that he is a just king; and may Baalath, 'Lady of Gebal, grant him favour in the sight of God, and in 'the sight of the people of this land, and in the sight of the 'people of other lands for ever.' As late as the year 131 B.C. we find another Phœnician temple builder, south of Tyre, praying for 'a good name beneath the feet of my lord, the 'master of the heavens.'

The annual feasts of spring, the arks, the papyrus boats, with images of the sun god, the mourning for Adonis, the furious orgies and fanatical self-mutilations, the license, the human sacrifices, the immolation of infants, which the Phœnicians shared with other Eastern peoples, have been described by every writer on Phœnicia, from Movers downwards. It is strange, however, that Canon Rawlinson does not refer to their rite of circumcision. Herodotus distinctly mentions it, and says that the Phœnicians who came into contact with the Greeks abandoned the custom, as did the Jews of the Greek period. Circumcision was not peculiar to Hebrews and Arabs; it was an Egyptian custom also, and is found even among Zulus, though with them and with other tribes of South Africa it may originate in the very ancient and uninterrupted influence of the Arabs on the east coasts.

The monuments give us also a glimpse of Phœnician

beliefs as to the future state. These in no way differed from those of Greeks and Chaldeans. A gloomy Hades, whence there was no escape, peopled with ghosts and hungry shadows, weak and wandering in darkness—such was the Sheol of the Phœnicians. To it the Hebrew prophet refers when he depicts the arrival of a Tyrian king in Hades.

'Sheol beneath is moved for thee to meet thy coming: it stirreth up the shades (*Rephaim*) for thee: all the chief ones of the earth: it hath raised from their thrones all the kings of the nations. All they shall speak and say, Art thou become weak as we? art thou become like unto us?' (Isaiah xiv. 9, 10).

So also Eshmunazar, in the pathetic appeal to future generations not to desecrate his coffin, left as his curse the words, 'May such a one have no resting place among the 'shades (*Repham*), nor be buried in a tomb; neither be there 'son nor seed in his place,' a curse which actually came home in the nineteenth century to those who disregarded his prayer. No hope of future escape from this dark underworld is ever expressed, though the words for 'soul' and 'spirit' used in Hebrew also occur in Phœnician. The most that was hoped for was rest and peace, but the lament of Eshmunazar over his life, 'cut off before his time,' reminds us of the despair of Achilles in the 'Odyssey.'

'Talk not of ruling in this dolorous gloom,
Nor think vain words (he cried) can ease my doom.
Rather I'd choose laboriously to bear
A weight of woes and breathe the vital air,
A slave to some poor hind that toils for bread,
Than reign the sceptred monarch of the dead.'

Another question connected with Phœnician worship is that of the knowledge which they possessed of the sacred name of Jehovah. To this Canon Rawlinson does not allude, and the question is ignored, or the evidence slighted, by purely literary critics, who, like Wellhausen, would have us believe that the name was only that of the tribal god of Moses' family. Students of the monuments, and Phœnician scholars, agree in a very different estimate of the facts. Schrader has shown that from about 900 B.C. onward the 'name' was known in Assyria, in Syria, in Philistia, and even farther south and west, to other branches of the Semitic race as well as to the Hebrews. Jehovah was not worshipped in Moab, but in Hamath his name formed part of royal names, as among the Hebrews. Phœnician texts from Malta also reveal it, and a Phœnician coin of later date presents

Jehovah riding in a chariot, with the holy name written above. There is, therefore, no reason to doubt that the *Iao* of the Gnostics, and of the Clarian oracle which refers to Phœnician religion, was but a form of the divine name of a god recognised as above all gods, and never associated, on gems or texts, with any other deity. The Phœnicians seem to have advanced from polytheism to monotheism, rather than to have retrograded in their religious beliefs, and the same idea of an All-father meets us in Egypt, in hymns believed to be as old as the fourteenth century before our era.

Of Phœnician literature we have no extant remains. They wrote, no doubt, like the Hebrews, on parchment and on papyrus, for it is not necessary to suppose, as Canon Rawlinson has done, that the latter would be obtained only in Egypt. The papyrus grew also in the Euphrates, and the Akkadians are thought to have used it. The Egyptian papyrus, as well as the Syrian species, is found in many of the Phœnician streams; but the climate, less dry than that of Egypt, did not favour the preservation of such materials, and only texts on stone, on bronze, and on gems and coins have survived. It is possible that a busy trading race like the Phœnicians had as little time to devote to literature as has our own middle class, but philosophy was not without its representatives among them in later days. Zeno, the first Stoic, was of Phœnician origin, and other names might be added of those who expounded the cosmogonies of Byblos, Sidon, and Syros, which were substantially the same that were received at Nineveh and Babylon. Their ideas, however, like those of Sanchoniathon, have only reached us in mutilated fragments, in the works of Greek and of Christian authors.

The Phœnician calendar, concerning which we obtain some knowledge from the monuments, presents points of general interest which have been overlooked or misrepresented. The calendar which the Phœnicians used in their own country, in Cyprus, and at Carthage appears to have been the same, and continued in use down to the second century B.C. It was composed of lunar months, and the 'new moon,' or beginning of the month, is mentioned on the monuments more than once. The year was either vague, as among Moslems, or intercalated, as among Hebrews and Assyrians, who never used the Egyptian solar year. But the month names in Phœnicia, of which seven are known, were quite different from those of the Assyrians, which the Jews

after their captivity, and the later Palmyrenes, adopted. It is important, therefore, to note that among these names Bul and Ethanim occur, for these also occur in the Old Testament, as the older names of the eleventh and tenth months respectively, which after the Captivity were called by the names Marchesvan and Tisri. The older Hebrew calendar—of which we know but little, since only Abib and Zif are mentioned in addition to the above (called later Nisan and Iyar respectively)—seems therefore in all probability to have been the same as the Phœnician. It was the native calendar of Palestine, as distinguished from that of Mesopotamia. It need hardly be remarked that a rough indication is afforded, by the use of these names, of the date of those earlier books of the Old Testament which, penned before the Captivity, naturally refer to the older nomenclature, while in works like Ezra and Nehemiah, written after the return from Babylon, the Assyrian calendar, adopted by the exiles, is alone mentioned. Renan, however, has preferred the somewhat lame explanation that these names are only used because the passages in question refer to the Phœnician builders of Solomon's temple. This excuse does not explain the use of the names Abib and Zif. Further discoveries may, it is to be hoped, give us the whole nomenclature of the Phœnician months, and so complete the comparison with that of the Hebrew calendar.

In further completion of the picture of Phœnician civilisation the questions of their architecture and art are important, and furnish other points of interest in comparing them with the Hebrews and with other ancient nations.

We as yet know very little concerning Phœnician masonry and architecture. The rock tombs, which closely resembled those of the Hebrews, show that in the earlier period the dead were not embalmed, or swathed in the bulky mummy cloths of Egypt. The graves were not large enough to hold such mummies, and it was only in the times of the Ptolemies that great sarcophagi were used in Phœnicia, when masks of gold at times covered the face of the dead, as also among Asiatic Greeks. Some of the tombs were entered from the face of the cliff, as is usual in Hebrew sepulchres; others, as in Egypt, were reached by deep wells or shafts, and an example was found in 1873 even as far south as Athlit, under Mount Carmel. The Hebrews never sank such shafts. Hence Hebrew tombs were more easily rifled than those of Tyre and Sidon. Both races sometimes made sarcophagi of terra cotta, like the Etruscans. In the Greek

age a different form of sepulchre came into use, with sarcophagi either rock-hewn or made of hard stone and lowered into the vault. It is remarkable that these tombs hardly ever bore inscriptions cut upon them. Renan has supposed that bronze inscribed tablets were affixed, and certain marks on the rock lend colour to this view; but no such tablets have been found. In Palestine only two inscribed tombs of any antiquity are known, both on the confines of Samaria. It is only about the Christian era that Hebrew texts on tombs appear, and even Eshmunazar's inscribed sarcophagus at Sidon probably does not date earlier than the time of the Seleucidæ.

One indisputably Phœnician group of monuments, also rock-cut, has, however, been found by Renan at the ancient Marathus—namely, the Ma'abed, or 'place of worship,' and the two older shrines near Ain el Haiyeh, 'the serpent spring,' in the same vicinity—but, like others in the same region, the Ma'abed itself does not appear to date earlier than the Greek period. The Carthaginian monuments are also all of very late date, and show the influence of Greek or of Roman art. A sculptured fragment given by Renan shows us that the two older shrines at the 'serpent spring' once formed the shelters for seated statues, and on these, as well as on other fragments, a cornice composed of *uræi*, or hooded snakes, crowns the work—an ornament which seems to show Egyptian influence, while in other cases the winged sun is carved, as in Egypt or Assyria.

The walls of Eryx, in Sicily, are pretty certainly Phœnician, since the lower stones are marked with Phœnician letters. The stones are rudely squared and of unequal height; they bear no drafted edges, and they occur in connexion with false arches, such as have been found at Tiryns, Mycenæ, and in Etruria. It is important to know that these same false arches were discovered, in 1881, to occur in the great aqueduct at Tyre, showing that, in part, it is much older than usually supposed. No Phœnician masonry is known to bear a drafted margin before Greek times, and students generally are coming to the conclusion that this finish to the stones was of Greek origin. The oldest known example is in the Acropolis at Athens. The wall of Tortosa, popularly called Phœnician, is in reality Crusading work, for the drafted margin was used by the Romans and the Byzantines, and copied later by the Normans and the Arabs. To regard such masonry as Phœnician is a popular fallacy, as has been

proved by careful examination of the tooling of the stones in dated monuments of various ages.

Canon Rawlinson, however, adopts the popular view, which ascribes the existing masonry of the Haram at Jerusalem to Solomon's Phœnician masons, and he supports it by the assertion—which originated with Dr. Deutsch—that Phœnician masons' marks occur on the lower courses. What acquaintance Dr. Deutsch may have possessed with questions of Semitic epigraphy it is not possible to say from a study of his published works, which relate to quite different questions, but there is every reason to dispute his dictum in this matter. Canon Rawlinson can hardly have consulted the facsimile plates, which show the marks discovered by Sir Charles Warren, or he would have seen that in no single case was a really Phœnician mark, either letter or numeral, discovered. The majority are rude and arbitrary masons' signs, which may be of any age. The three most distinct emblems resemble the Greek letters *eta*, *gamma*, and *rho*, and if they be Semitic letters they belong to a very late period, more closely resembling the native alphabet of the Herodian age. The same deduction is to be made from the dressing of the Haram stones, which resembles that of the masonry at the Palace of Hyrcanus, beyond Jordan, built in 176 B.C. At Baalbek, in the second century A.D., similar masonry bears Greek masons' marks. The tooling of the Haram stones is peculiar, and is the same found on the later Carthaginian monuments. A toothed chisel was used, and it has recently been shown that this instrument was used in Greece in the finish of certain parts of the statues. There is thus no evidence whatever that a single stone of Solomon's temple now remains. Josephus tells us distinctly that Herod removed the ancient foundations and laid others, and the evidence of style, lettering, and tooling supports his statement. The Phœnician masonry at Eryx and at Tyre, which must be of great antiquity on account of the false arches, differs entirely from the Greek style of the Temple wall at Jerusalem, and it has never as yet been shown that, before the Greek age, the Phœnicians, or any other Asiatics, used a drafted masonry. The first authority to explode the popular opinion on this subject was De Vogüé, and he has been followed by all those who have given serious and special attention to the question. Megalithic masonry which may be Phœnician occurs on the mole at Sidon, but it is not drafted. Huge stones were used by the Egyptians and by the dolmen builders, but yet huger

blocks—each the size of a cottage—were employed by the Antonines. The Phœnicians at Tyre and at Carthage appear to have discovered the use of concrete, which rendered them able to build, with much less labour, equally durable structures; but in the earlier times their masonry appears to have approached the Cyclopean work (as Pausanias calls it) which is found in Etruscan city walls, in the early remains of Greek cities, in Lebanon, in Malta, and far east in Persia. Half a century ago every wall with drafted masonry, even in Crusading chapels and in Byzantine churches, used to be supposed of Phœnician origin; but careful study of the pointed arches, and diagonal dressing, and Norman masons' marks proved, when systematic exploration was undertaken in Palestine, that such views were quite unfounded, and that the really Phœnician remains of masonry in Syria are very scanty.

Of the character of Phœnician temples we are also unable to judge, save in as far as they are represented on coins. The plan given by Cesnola of the temple at Paphos, which Canon Rawlinson reproduces, has been found to be purely imaginary. In 1887 the site was excavated; and a plan made by R. E. Smith, Esq., when the ground had been cleared, shows how erroneous was the former guess as to the position and extent of this famous shrine of Aphrodite.* Two buildings of different age—one Roman, the other Greek or Phœnician—were laid bare. The latest work is drafted, but the inscriptions found were Greek and Cypriote, and no Phœnician text was here recovered. Nor is this the only case in which the hasty conclusions of Cesnola have been too easily accepted by later writers.

The coins representing the temple at Byblos show a small fane with a cloister open to the air, and a paved court in which the sacred doves of Ashtoreth are walking, as they still strut round the mosques of Palestine. The chief object in this court is the great obelisk, which was the emblem of the deity. Solomon's temple must have resembled such a shrine. Its adornment with gold and cedar recalls that of the temples described at Babylon in the historic texts of Nebuchadnezzar, and the adornment of Greek palaces in the early days of the Homeric poems. Its brazen altar recalls that altar of bronze which, with a shrine adorned with gold and a cloister with pillars, was made by Jehumelek at Gebal, as his extant inscription informs us. Even the great

* See 'Excavations in Cyprus, 1887–8,' Journal of Hellenic Studies.

laver of the first Jerusalem temple finds its parallel in the enormous stone laver found at Amathus, which is adorned with figures of bulls within its four handles. The diameter is nine feet and the height six. This huge limestone vase was brought to the Louvre in 1866, and a second like it was found at the same site. The first-mentioned example weighed about fifteen tons. Though not found in a temple, it has been conjectured to have been intended for religious rites of purification.

The same caution which it is necessary to observe in attributing undated masonry to the Phœnicians is also necessary in the attribution of statues, seal cylinders, bronzes, and jewelry found in Cyprus or in Phœnicia itself. A certain number of such objects which bear Phœnician letters are indisputable, and form a safe basis for comparison, but even among these careful distinction must be made of those which are Aramaic and of which the derivation is uncertain. The result of such study is to show that Phœnician art at first closely resembled that of Babylon, and afterwards—about 500 B.C. at earliest—was influenced by Egypt, an influence which predominated about 200 B.C., and then gradually gave way to that of Greece.

But many statues found by Cesnola and reproduced in the spirited illustrations of MM. Perrot and Chipiez, some of which Canon Rawlinson has borrowed, are very doubtfully to be regarded as Phœnician. It was natural enough that their archaic character should have led to such a conclusion when they were found, for at that time the Cypriote texts were unread and were believed to be Semitic. They proved, however, to be Greek, and the ancient painted statues found afterwards at Athens are of similar character. These are not Phœnician, but early Greek, as shown by the red hair and blue eyes and Aryan features of the goddesses. It is probable that the majority of the Cyprus statues are also Greek, and many also of the sarcophagi called Phœnician, but representing Greek mythical subjects, such as the birth of Chrysaor. It is observable that in style these doubtful statues do not resemble the really Phœnician bas-reliefs, which show no signs of Greek influence. The Greeks must have reached Cyprus very early. By 600 B.C. they were established in Egypt,* and Asiatic Greeks invaded that

* Naucratis, which was assigned to the Greeks by Amasis (Aahmes II.), about 570 B.C., as the trading depot (Herod. ii. 178–9), is by some regarded as having been founded about 750 B.C. It was certainly older

country even in the thirteenth century B.C. In the 'Odyssey' the Cyprian king bears a Greek name, and Greek kings ruled at various Cyprian cities in the fifth century B.C. Canon Rawlinson has included among Phœnician art objects a medal bearing in Cypriote characters the name *Akestodaros*, with others having the names of the Egyptian monarchs Thothmes III., Amenophis III., and Seti I. In so doing he follows MM. Perrot and Chipiez, who, however, having no apparent knowledge of epigraphy, have been frequently misled by the errors of Cesnola. That a Greek population existed side by side with the Phœnicians in Cyprus is proved by the well-known bilingual text of Melekyathon (about 370 B.C.); and though the story of Eumæus shows that from such intercourse a mixed Greco-Phœnician stock may have arisen, it is only really safe to call Phœnician the gems which bear Phœnician texts, of which a large number are found in museums. In the same relation it must be noted that there is no apparent reason why the royal armlets of Etyander, king of Paphos, should be called Phœnician, seeing that they are inscribed in Greek. The character of much of the Cypriote jewelry resembles that found at Mycenæ, and it is to be regarded, by the light of these more recent discoveries, as of archaic Greek rather than of Phœnician origin.

The Phœnicians were, however, not only the carriers of the ancient world, but among its chief artisans and artists as well. The Carthaginian woodwork, the Sidonian woven robes, were equally prized, but especially the metallic wares in gold, silver, and bronze which their artists made. Sidonian bowls are mentioned more than once in the Homeric poetry. In the 'Odyssey' we read of

> '. . . . the massy mould of silver graced,
> By Vulcan's art the verge of gold enchased,
> A pledge the sceptred power of Sidon gave
> When to his realm I ploughed the orient wave;'

while Helen speaks of

> 'Webs by Sidonian virgins finely wrought,
> From Sidon's looms by youthful Paris brought.'

We have seen already that, in 1600 B.C., the Phœnicians

than the time of Amasis, but the Greek remains there excavated do not appear to be older than the sixth century B.C. The Ionian mercenaries of Psammetichus penetrated, however, as far south as Abu Simbel (Herod. ii. 152), and appear with the Carians as the first settlers in the Delta of Greek race.

were famous for their artistic vases; and the bronzes of Etruria with those of Greece may have been originally copied from Phœnician models, though the Akkadians may have been the earliest masters from whom Tyrian and Sidonian goldsmiths learned their trade. There are still in existence bowls, found at various times, which are enriched with designs of Phœnician character, some mythological, others representing scenes of the hunt and of battle. MM. Perrot and Chipiez have given us excellent plates of this collection of ancient craters.

Much that concerns the art and mythology of Phœnicia may also be gathered from the seals and the cylinders used as amulets or as sign manuals on clay tablets, which bear Phœnician letters. They were made in hard stone, or engraved on gems, and resemble those of the Akkadians and Assyrians, with others from Lydia and Cappadocia. Yet they are easily distinguished, by their inscriptions, from those which bear cuneiform emblems, or which present the more archaic Syrian and Asia Minor hieroglyphics commonly called 'Hittite.' These seal cylinders do not appear to have been used in Egypt, and the figures represented are usually similar, not to Egyptian, but to Chaldean mythical types. The scarabeus, the sphinx, and other monstrous forms found in Phœnicia occur in Mesopotamia as well as in Egypt. The chimæra, the harpy, and other figures usual in Greece do not seem to occur on Phœnician gems. Coins of Tyre, Sidon, and other towns, with Phœnician legends, are common; but these as a rule belong to a very late historic period.

It may be noted, in passing, that the extremely rude and archaic forms of the pottery statuettes and figures found in tombs, as well as of certain painted vases, do not of necessity always indicate a very early date. The age must, where possible, be judged by the characters inscribed on such work; but the rude, inartistic pottery continued to be manufactured to later days. It bears, in fact, to the best specimens of Phœnician art the same relation that the works of a village potter in Palestine still bear to the finished work from Damascus. The traders must have offered wares at various prices, suited to the purses and tastes of various classes. The poor required small votive objects, to suspend in temples or to bury in tombs, and they could not afford the costly vases made for princes. Hence side by side with higher art existed the cheap and coarse ware of which so much has of late years been collected, not only in Phœnicia,

but in Greece and in Chaldea. This distinction of class, as well as of date, has not always been recognised by antiquaries.

It is to be regretted that one of the finest collections of antiquities found in Phœnicia was dispersed, some years since, on the death of M. Peretié, whose museum at Beirut was one of the delights of travelling archæologists. The best part of his collection has found its way to the Louvre, but, seen all together, it gave a more vivid picture of Phœnician culture than any that is presented by European museums. We still, however, await the publication of the great discoveries of 1887 at Sidon, which are perhaps the most important yet made in Phœnicia. Hamdi Bey, the energetic and able curator of the Constantinople Museum, has claimed, very justly, the right to be the first to bring before the public the results of the excavations in the newly opened tombs, and the accounts which have as yet reached Europe are vague and uncertain. The articles, carefully collected, were carried to the Sultan's capital, and will be displayed at the Stamboul Museum. They are known to include sculptured sarcophagi and treasures of gold and silver. It will, however, require very strong evidence to convince sober students that the sarcophagus of Alexander the Great—who died, be it remembered, at Babylon—is among these latest discoveries, especially as no inscription seems to have been found confirming such a startling announcement. The treasures are probably of the Greek, or at earliest of the Persian, period; but the latter epoch was one of great prosperity in Phœnicia, and the new treasures may prove of high interest in connexion with the history of the Jews on their return from captivity.

Nothing need be said at length as to the dress and fabrics of the Phœnicians. In costume they were Oriental and resembled their neighbours. The conical cap which they wore was also worn by the Hittites. It has been found represented in Armenia on archaic bas-reliefs. It was known to the Etruscans, and continued to be worn in Commagene in Roman times. It is still notable in Persia and Turkestan, and in other parts of Western Asia, and was usual among Scythians and among the mediæval Tartar tribes near the Volga. It appears to have distinguished princes, and its Italian name was the *tutulus*, which is found on the paintings in Etruscan tombs.

It must, however, not be supposed that gold, silver, ivory, rich woods, dyed robes, gems, and rude ores were the only

objects of Phœnician trade. Ezekiel, enumerating all the riches of Tyre, in a well-known passage which shows how their commerce during the Persian period reached to India, Arabia, the Caucasus, and the isles of Greece, especially notes that they 'traded in the persons of men' (Ezek. xxvii. 13). The pictures already mentioned, which represent the Phœnician tribute to Egypt about 1600 B.C., show us diminutive yellow figures of children, led by the hand by the Kharu. According to the Hebrew prophet these child slaves would have been Tubalians, Moschians, and Ionians; and the races of Asia Minor down to recent times—especially the Georgians—have been in the habit of selling their children. But such captives were often, no doubt, seized by force and stolen by fraud. In the Homeric poems there are hints that such kidnapping practices rendered the Phœnicians hateful and mistrusted. The faithful Eumæus was himself so kidnapped, by his Phœnician nurse, from his father's court; and the episode gives us a vivid idea of the Phœnician methods of trading with Greeks.

> '"Him, childlike wandering, I will lead away,
> "A noble prize, and to your ship convey."
> Thus spoke the girl and homeward took the road.
> A year they traffic and their vessel load.
> Their stores complete, and ready now to weigh,
> A spy they sent their summons to convey.
> An artist to my father's palace came
> With gold and amber chains, elaborate frame.
> Each female eye the glittering links employ;
> They turn, review, and cheapen every toy.'

But in later days retribution overtook these ancient slave traders in the loss of their own children. Plautus, writing, it is believed, in 224 B.C., inserts into his drama of 'Pœnulus' a passage written in Roman characters but in the Punic language. He represents Hanno, a Carthaginian, vainly seeking his daughters in the streets of Rome, carrying an amulet, or carved image of his deity, and invoking the gods of the foreign land, where his speech was ridiculed by the vulgar. Although much doubt arises as to the translation of parts of this curious passage, enough is understood to show, as the monuments of Carthage also show, how near to ancient Hebrew was the Punic speech. The word *Makom* for the 'place' or 'shrine' (in Arabic *Makâm*) of a deity is here used, in the same sense in which it is to be understood in various passages of the Old Testament. The lines in

Plautus show also that Carthaginian was not an unintelligible language to educated Romans.

Thus far we have been concerned rather in obtaining a fairly complete view of the most interesting particulars of Phœnician and Punic history and civilisation than in following Canon Rawlinson's account, which has a somewhat more limited scope. A few criticisms have been hazarded, and a few others may be here added, not with the object of depreciating a valuable and interesting work, but rather of presenting to the author's consideration points which might, in a future edition, receive further treatment. In scholarship, and in knowledge of ancient history, Canon Rawlinson far surpasses the somewhat sketchy popular work of MM. Perrot and Chipiez. The latter have taken their facts second-hand as a rule, and have often been led astray by the bold assertions of those who speak with more authority than learning; but to the French authors we owe the best collection of plates ever gathered to illustrate Phœnician antiquities, except, indeed, the corpus of inscriptions so admirably printed by Renan; and these plates alone, many of which reappear in Canon Rawlinson's book, will always render the French history of Phœnician art useful to scholars.

Canon Rawlinson is, however, not always quite up to date as regards either Phœnicia or Palestine. His authorities are somewhat old, and precede the days of systematic exploration. He has reproduced Renan's incorrect plan of Tyre, and omits to mention the discovery of the true site of the Egyptian harbour, which the English explorers defined in 1881. The neocomian sandstone in the Lebanon does not overlie, but underlies, the chalk formation. Among the fauna no mention is made of the roebuck, which was, in 1872, discovered to exist on Carmel, and has since been shown to inhabit Lebanon and Gilead. The ancient fauna also included the terrible wild bulls (*Bos primigenius*), which were called *Reem* by the Assyrians, and which in the Bible are to be recognised wherever the English (following a mistake of the Septuagint translation) renders the word *Reem* by 'unicorn.' Tiglath Pileser records his hunting of the *Reem* in the Lebanon, and the remains of this ancient wild bull have been found in the bone caves.

The lion also survived very late in Syria. It is mentioned by an Egyptian traveller in the fourteenth century B.C., and was familiar to the Hebrews. Bones of the lion are said to have been discovered in the Jordan gravel, and it is repre-

sented on Assyrian bas-reliefs as late as the seventh century B.C., while on monuments of Asia Minor it is shown as hunted in chariots. Nor need this extended habitat in Asia astonish us, when we reflect that the army of Xerxes, according to Herodotus, was attacked, yet later by lions in Greece.

Canon Rawlinson is unacquainted, it would seem, with the 'Memoirs of the Survey of Western Palestine,' which would have enabled him to correct several slight errors in his account of the country. Samaria, for instance, does not stand on a 'wooded cone' (p. 5), but on a long flat hill with terraces of olive trees. The greatest height of Carmel is 1,700 and not 1,200 feet. Jebel esh Sheikh means 'mountain of the [Druze] chieftain,' not 'the old white-headed man;' and *Tilj* is a vulgar pronunciation of *Thelj*, meaning not 'ice' but 'snow' (p. 14). The cedars usually visited, and sadly thinned by goats and peasants, are not the most numerous cluster of noble trees on Lebanon (p. 16). The lake on the east side of the mountain is not called Lemone, but *Yammûneh*, and is the old lake of *Amuli*, mentioned in the records of Rameses II. (p. 19). The Scala Tyriorum appears to have possessed a good road, cut in the rock, at least as early as Roman times, and perhaps earlier; and there are no 'staircases' impassable by pack animals on this coast (p. 28). The Phœnicians were not the first miners and metallurgists (p. 55), for the Egyptians and Akkadians may both claim precedence. Another minor slip is the assertion that *kha* is Assyrian for 'fish' (p. 332): the Assyrian was *nun*, and the word *kha* is Mongolian and found only in Akkadian on the cuneiform monuments. It still survives in Turanian speech, especially in Finnish dialects. *Nun* is a regular Semitic word, known also in Hebrew and in Syriac. These and other smaller slips are, however, of little importance in comparison with the careful compilation, from authentic sources, of what may be known of the Phœnicians. As already noted, however, three of the most important Phœnician inscriptions discovered of late years have escaped the notice of Canon Rawlinson, and should find a place in any future edition.

The reader of these pages cannot but be struck with the immense antiquity of civilisation in Western Asia, whence, as a centre, trade, art, and literature spread westwards to the Greeks and Italians, and eastwards to India and China. The monuments show us that at least as early as 2500 B.C. distinct civilisations existed in Chaldea, in Syria, and in

Egypt. It is true that the early date which has been assigned to Menes, by scholars who reckon thirty years as the average reign of an Egyptian monarch (whereas the dated reigns often do not exceed five or six), rests on no secure basis, and extravagant estimates, based on equally unsafe deductions, have been offered by some of our cuneiform scholars, who would carry back Akkadian civilisation to 4000 B.C.; but these extravagancies do not discredit the facts which are deduced from better data, and which show that, even earlier than the period usually assigned as the time when the pastoral Hebrew patriarchs found their way along the Euphrates and through Syria to Egypt, there were organised states, walled towns, chariots and horses, riches of gold and silver, bronze and iron, of corn, wine, and oil, not only among the Akkadians and in Egypt, but also in Phœnicia and in Palestine.

The government of the Phœnicians at home was directed by petty princes, like the Greek chiefs, and even in the later Assyrian days numerous chiefs from Cyprus, from Phœnicia, and from all parts of Palestine east and west of the Jordan are enumerated. In the later days of Carthaginian prosperity some form of republic does, indeed, appear to have existed. Livy informs us that Suffetes, or 'judges' (the same word used in the Bible for the Hebrew judges), were chosen by the populace from the great families, who presided over the senate—a permanent body of 300 citizens. There was a smaller committee of thirty senators, and a superior council of ten elected by the thirty. Such was the constitution under which Hannibal had to work, and it might have been better for him, and for his country, if he had served a single prince. In Phœnicia itself the kings of the various cities were leagued in time of danger, as the Greek princes were leagued against Troy, nor do any serious contentions appear to have arisen respecting the colonies, for the ancient world requiring the trader was wide, and there was room for all.

The account of the civilisation of these states, which is deducible from contemporary inscriptions and other monumental sources, serves to confirm, in a most remarkable manner, that picture of the ancient condition of Palestine and Syria which is contained in the earlier books of the Old Testament. It was a prosperous and settled country, with cities, fields, traders, and scribes (though not of any alphabetic writing), which Abraham must have entered; and his position was that still held by some of the independent Arab Emirs,

who, while despising trade and agriculture and preferring the freedom of the desert, yet live in peaceful relations with a settled population, whence they draw many of their supplies. It has been in vain, therefore, that critics, whose studies have not included that of the monuments, and who discard the results of cuneiform or hieroglyphic research, have striven to prove that such a picture is an anachronism, due to the ignorance of later writers. Critics used, a century ago, to maintain that writing was unknown before the time of Herodotus; but dated inscriptions nearly a thousand years earlier have belied what was once considered the result of scientific, if sceptical, enquiry. Another school has now arisen, which seeks to degrade the ancient religions of Asia to a system of totemism, or fetish worship, of which no traces occur, as we have seen, in inscriptions; for we may set aside the hasty sketch of Assyrian religion, with its astounding derivations and forced deductions, which was recently put forward as the latest result of cuneiform research, in favour of the more sober and scholarly views of Sir Henry Rawlinson, George Smith, and Fox Talbot. The superstitions of the lower classes may be represented in the sacred beast worship, which so long survived in Egypt. The gods of the Hittites, the Akkadians, the Phœnicians, and the Assyrians had their favourite trees and animals, as in Greece or in India. The ancient warriors bore, as crests on their shields, some emblem from the animal creation, just as the Greeks are seen to have done, on the beautiful and ancient vase recently found in Corinth; but, if we would understand aright the religion of the ancients, we must consider those noble thoughts which are preserved in Egyptian hymns and in the plaintive litanies of the Akkadians, and remember the beautiful words of Deuteronomy—

'Lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun and the moon and the stars, even the whole host of heaven, shouldest be driven to worship them and serve them, which the Lord thy God hath divided unto all nations under the whole heaven' (iv. 19).

It is, perhaps, not unnatural that an exclusive study of savage tribes, such as our leading anthropologists have so successfully followed out, should predispose the mind to regard all the ancients as if represented only by the lowest and most ignorant among their peasants, whose superstitions have been alike in every part of Asia, and in all ages; but the ancients were not savages. The wisdom and humanity

of Homer are anticipated by the purity and love which breathe in the maxims of Ani, penned, perhaps, earlier than the days of Moses. If there was, on the one hand, a barbarous license of manners and a savage cruelty in war among the ancients, there was also much piety, humanity, and true religion among them. If the gods of the heathen were idols, yet the wise knew that they were but emblems of an underlying truth. Pity for the poor, love of justice, the pious memory of the dead, the respect for promises, and the love of child and wife meet us in every land, on the monuments and in the literature of the ancients. We may well doubt if civilisation has, in our own times, done very much to strengthen these foundations of society; and if there was no expectation in the future, save an endless impotence in the dark mists of Hades, yet there was a very real belief that the evil life goes not unpunished; for, in the words of Ani with which we may conclude, we find an ancient echo of true religious thought.

'If thou art become great, having been humble; if thou art rich, having been poor, and art therefore the greatest in thy city; if thou art known for thy wealth, and hast been made a mighty lord—let not thine heart be lifted up because of riches, for it is God who hath given all these things to thee. Despise thou not, therefore, another who now is as thou wast, and be towards him as towards thine equal.'

ART. V.—*A Publisher and his Friends: Memoir and Correspondence of the late John Murray, with an Account of the Origin and Progress of the House* (1768–1843). By SAMUEL SMILES, LL.D. Two volumes. 8vo. London: 1891.

MR. GLADSTONE has stated, in a brief review of these volumes, that he is the only man now living who can boast that he has had Mr. Murray, second of his race, for his publisher. We can assure Mr. Gladstone that he has been misinformed, and that there are some, at least, of his contemporaries still alive who enjoyed the same privilege, and who are as anxious as he is himself to pay a tribute of respect to a man not more distinguished for his shrewdness and energy in matters of business than for his munificence, his high sense of honour, and his extreme kindliness of heart. To those who knew Mr. Murray, these volumes are a pleasant memorial of his inexhaustible hospitality, his lively conversation, and his genial manners: he raised his calling in life to the rank of a power in society; and he never was more in

his element than when the brightest men of the day met round his dinner-table in the back drawing-room in Albemarle Street. We learn, therefore, with great satisfaction from this publication that there are in existence ample records of his active and intelligent life, which will be read with interest by another generation, to whom his name, at least, is as familiar as it was to their predecessors half a century ago. Fond of a joke, smart at repartee, and gifted, as the elder Disraeli told him, with 'the happy art of giving 'interest even to commonplace correspondence,' he possessed great discrimination of character and an almost instinctive appreciation of literary excellence. His own letters are, even from an early age, models of clear, sensible, practical composition. He enters fully, but without the slightest affectation, on matters of business with feelings higher than those of trade; and he imparts to his transactions with many of the most eminent writers of the time and with his brethren 'in the trade' a highminded and generous spirit, which was the ruling principle of his life.

John Murray was born in 1778 under a lucky star, for he entered upon life within a few years of the birth of a host of poets and writers in every branch of literature, who were destined to make the next half-century an epoch in our history. Scott, Southey, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Moore, and Hallam belonged to the same generation. Gifford and Isaac Disraeli were his seniors; Byron by ten years his junior. They all found in Murray an intelligent coadjutor, who contributed with them to raise the profession of men of letters to a rank it had not reached since the death of Pope. The circumstances of his early life marked out his future career. The publishing house of Murray had been founded in 1768 by his father, John Murray the first, a retired lieutenant of marines, who purchased the business of William Sandby, which was carried on opposite St. Dunstan's Church in Fleet Street. No great success attended this enterprise, which dealt chiefly with medical books; but we owe to the first Mr. Murray the edition of Lavater's Essays with Holloway's fine plates, which still adorns our shelves, and by which he unhappily lost 3,000*l*. In 1793 he died, leaving his business in the hands of 'a drone of a partner,' Mr. Highley, and of his only son, then a schoolboy of fifteen:—

> 'Strahan, Tonson, Lintot of the times,
> Patron and publisher of rhymes,
> For whom the bard up Pindus climbs,
> My Murray!'

Under Highley's management the business languished, but did not expire, and when young Murray came of age he submitted to the partnership, which he disliked, for three years more. In 1802, however, he dissolved it in a peremptory letter; and from that moment he stood alone in his business, never having admitted anyone to share his labours or his responsibility until his own son succeeded to his confidence in the house. 'On the twenty-fifth day of this month,' he writes to Colman, 'I plunge *alone* into the depths of literary 'speculation;' and by way of a beginning, he offers him 300*l.* for the copyright of the play of 'John Bull.' The offer was (fortunately) declined, but the poet was even more pleased by the manner of the offer than by its solidity. From the very first the chief object of the young publisher was to establish what he called 'a respectable connexion,' by which he meant the confidence of the leading writers of the day and a high rank amongst the members of his craft. To this object he willingly sacrificed pecuniary considerations, and even risked commercial loss to gain professional reputation, which he seems before the age of thirty to have acquired.

A large portion of his correspondence relates to transactions of business with his principal contemporaries in the trade, which are of interest to the commercial history of literature, and still more as illustrative of Mr. Murray's own character. We shall confine ourselves to one example of them. The principal firms of Edinburgh—Messrs. Constable, Ballantyne, and Blackwood—ranked with those of London in the importance of their publications, and the connexion between these firms and their London correspondents was of great value to both parties, though not unaccompanied with open credits, often on the wrong side. In 1805 Messrs. Constable and Longman were jointly engaged in several periodical and other works; amongst others, in the sale of this Journal. But differences arose between them; a hot correspondence followed; and it was resolved in Edinburgh that the London publication of the 'Edinburgh Review' should be transferred to John Murray of Fleet Street, with the prospect of a most extensive and intimate connexion with the great Scottish house. 'It was one of those chances,' says Mr. Smiles, which, 'taken at the flood, lead on to fortune; but there was 'also the question of honour, and Mr. Murray, notwithstanding his desire for opening out a splendid new connexion 'in business, would do nothing inconsistent with the strictest honour. He was most unwilling to thrust himself 'between Constable and Longman.' Instead, therefore, of

jumping at Constable's advantageous offer, his feelings induced him to try and promote reconciliation between the parties; and he addressed to them both a long letter, admirable alike for its spirit and its language, and most remarkable as coming from a young and ambitious publisher to his two most important rivals.

'Recollect how serious every dispute becomes upon paper, when a man writes a thousand asperities merely to show or support his superior ability. Things that would not have been spoken, or perhaps even thought of in conversation, are stated and horribly magnified *upon paper*. Consider how many disputes have arisen in the world in which both parties were so violent in what they believed to be the support of truth, and which to the public, and indeed to themselves a few years afterwards, appeared unwise, because the occasion or cause of it was not worth contending about. Consider that you are, all of you, men who can depend upon each other's probity and honour, and, when these essentials are not wanting, surely in mere matters of business the rest may be palliated by mutual bearance and forbearance. Besides you are so connected by various publications, your common property, and some of them such as will remain so until the termination of your lives, that you cannot effect an entire disunion, and must therefore be subject to eternal vexations and regrets which will embitter every transaction and settlement between you.'

The split, however, was not avoided, and Messrs. Constable's books were transferred to Murray: even this Journal was for about two years in his hands, Messrs. Longman having accepted 1,000*l.* for their claim to a share in the copyright and sale of it. Meanwhile, Murray paid a visit to his friends in Edinburgh, and had the good fortune to bring back a most estimable wife. Ere long, the bills and promissory notes drawn on him by Messrs. Constable and Ballantyne, who had already entered upon the career which ended in ruin, became exacting, and his shrewdness warned him to stand aloof from their speculative transactions. He looked for success to himself alone, and sought no fresh alliances.

'Now that his reputation as a publisher was becoming established, Mr. Murray grew more particular as to the guise of the books which he issued. He employed the best makers of paper, the best printers, and the best bookbinders. He attended to the size and tone of the paper, the quality of the type, the accuracy of the printing, and the excellence of the illustrations. All this involved a great deal of correspondence. We find his letters to the heads of departments full of details as to the turn-out of his books. Everything, from the beginning to the end of the issue of a work—the first inspection of the MS., the consultation with confidential friends as to its fitness for publication, the form in which it was to appear, the correction of the

proofs, the binding, title, and final advertisement—engaged his closest attention. Besides the elegant appearance of his books, he also aimed at raising the standard of the literature which he published. He had to criticise as well as select; to make suggestions as to improvements when the manuscript was regarded with favour; and, finally, to launch the book at the right time, and under the best possible auspices. It might also be said of the publisher, as it is of the poet, that he is born, not made. And Mr. Murray appears from the beginning to the end of his career to have been a born publisher. (Vol. i. p. 69.)

The two most important events in the life of Mr. Murray were the foundation of the 'Quarterly Review' and his connexion with Lord Byron; and to these essential topics we shall confine our attention. Although he was acting, in 1807, as the London publisher of the 'Edinburgh Review,' he had no sympathy with its politics, for from first to last John Murray was a Tory of the old stamp, which might be termed *introuvable* at the present day; and the increasing popularity of the Whig organ seems only to have roused his desire to resist its influence and to create a rival power.

In September 1807 he addressed a letter to Mr. Canning, in which he said that the principles of the 'Edinburgh Review' 'were so radically bad that he had been led to think that some 'means equally popular ought to be adopted to counteract 'their dangerous tendency.' A further communication with the Minister was opened through Mr. Stratford Canning, whose acquaintance Mr. Murray had made, and in January 1808 Mr. Gifford was introduced to him by the Cannings as the future editor. An attempt had previously been made by them to induce Walter Scott to accept the editorial office, which he declined. We are proud to remember that the influence of this Journal was powerful enough to call into being the able rival with whom we have carried on an amicable warfare for the greater part of a century; but, whereas the 'Edinburgh Review' was founded by a group of young men of singular energy and eloquence, the 'Quarterly Re-'view' owes its existence entirely to the enterprise of Mr. Murray, who embarked in it, not only as a commercial speculation, but for the defence of the principles and the party to which he belonged. Indeed, for a considerable time the new Review did not pay its expenses, though the contributors—Scott, Southey, Ellis, D'Israeli, and Gifford—were always liberally remunerated, and Murray was supposed to have risked 5,000*l.* in the publication. But his confidence never failed him, and it is clear from this correspondence that he was himself the main conductor of the Review, with

Gifford for his literary adviser and assistant. In 1810 he wrote to Mr. Gifford:—

'If I am over anxious, it is because I have let my hopes of fame as a bookseller rest upon the establishment and celebrity of this journal. My character, as well with my professional brethren as with the public, is at stake upon it; for I would not be thought silly by the one, or a mere speculator by the other. I have a very large business, as you may conclude by the capital I have been able to throw into this one publication, and yet my mind is so entirely engrossed, my honour is so completely involved in this one thing, that I neither eat, drink, nor sleep upon anything else. I would rather it excelled all other journals and I gained nothing by it than gain 300*l.* a year by it without trouble if it were thought inferior to any other. This, Sir, is true.' (Vol. i. p. 135.)

The leading quarterly Reviews were established on party lines, for the defence respectively of the principles which divide in this country the political world and society. They have never been actuated or governed by commercial considerations, and the success they have obtained is due not to any bookselling speculations but to character and consistency. Mr. Jeffrey wrote to Constable in 1807 that neither he 'nor 'any of the original and regular writers in the Review would 'ever contribute a syllable to a work belonging to booksellers.' By which he meant to express his independence of the ordinary motives of trade. The object of the 'Edinburgh Review' was to advocate Liberal opinions, to defend constitutional rights and liberties, to assail the abuses which infested the public service and the legislation of that time, and to promote the good old cause of civil and religious freedom. The object of the 'Quarterly Review' was to defend the old institutions of the country, which were supposed to be in danger. Each of these publications has jealously adhered to the tradition of their respective principles, and would have repudiated that farrago of heterogeneous opinions, published under the names of distinguished authors, which forms the staple of a different class of periodical literature. From these traditions they have never deviated. But in process of time their relative position was changed by the course of events. For eight and twenty years the 'Edinburgh Review' was the organ of a vigorous opposition to the Tory Government and the intolerant opinions of that day, which justified a vehemence of language now out of date. In 1830 the principles of the Whig party prevailed, as they have continued to do to this day, with rare intervals; and the 'Quarterly Review' became the organ of a party which had lost its ascendency, and was

therefore an opponent and an assailant of the steady progress of popular government. The world knows the result. The great questions of Catholic Emanipation, Parliamentary Reform, the Corn Laws, and Free Trade were promoted by one of these journals and resisted by the other.

The Review founded by Mr. Murray was therefore essentially one of High Tory principles, and contributors of high literary rank, such as Walter Scott and Southey, D'Israeli, Croker, with Gifford and afterwards John Lockhart as editors, were its guiding spirits. Mr. Gifford retained the editorship for fifteen years, from 1809 to 1824, and he was during that period the principal adviser of Mr. Murray, with whom his relations were of the most intimate kind.

Mr. Gifford was treated with such profound respect by his contemporaries (for even Lord Byron addressed him in terms of almost servile reverence), and he is still represented in these volumes as so important a personage, that we have some difficulty in forming an opinion of his real merits. He undoubtedly possessed an extensive knowledge of English literature and a correct though severe taste and judgment in literary criticism. But we believe the 'Baviad' and 'Mæviad' have now few readers, and his best claim to distinction is his edition of Massinger. In all other respects we are at a loss to discover his eminent qualifications for the office he filled. He was a recluse and valetudinarian, who never had any place in general society, though we have heard his successor Mr. Lockhart say that the first duty of an editor is to dine out pretty frequently in the best London company. He was singularly unpunctual, insomuch that the Review was often delayed for weeks or months beyond the proper time of publication. He wrote nothing himself, but he spent amazing labour in revising, correcting, or as was said 'mutilating' the works of others, by infusing into them here and there a few drops of nitric acid, of which he had a large supply. His friends complained of the excessive acerbity of his criticisms, and his contributors bitterly resented his too frequent interference. We should have preferred the prose of Scott or Southey unadulterated to the Gifford mixture. Not being at all a man of the world, he had no urbanity, and seemed to take the delight of an old-fashioned schoolmaster in the castigation of dunces and fools. The result of our own experience is that it is wiser to let them alone.*

* A singular example of Gifford's strange ignorance of current

Such was the man who steered the vessel in which Mr. Murray had embarked his fortune and his ambition, and it required all his tact, good nature, and liberality to smooth her course. In point of fact, a very large part of the duties of an editor was performed by Murray himself. He corresponded with the contributors to the Review; he suggested subjects for articles; he was always in pursuit of writers of ability whom he brought into his fold; he entertained largely; and his purse was ever open, even when his own resources were limited. On one occasion, when the Review had taken a start, he sent Gifford a cheque for 500*l*. Our conclusion from this evidence is that, although the tone and temper of the 'Quarterly Review' were influenced by Gifford, it was the vigorous arm and open hand of Murray that really drove it onwards to power and success. Upon the retirement of Mr. Gifford in 1824, the Review was edited for a short time by a man of a far more genial temperament than his predecessor, who soon relinquished the profession of literature for the Bar, and became the excellent Mr. Justice Coleridge. Mr. Lockhart was then induced to quit Edinburgh for London, and no one has ever filled with more consummate ability and success the editorial chair. But Mr. Murray continued to take an active part in the management of the Review, and we meet with one instance in which Lockhart himself, though editor, submits an article of his own to the judgement of his publisher.

If the existence and the success of the 'Quarterly Review' were mainly due to Murray's spirit of enterprise and personal activity, the other leading event of his career, his connexion with Lord Byron, was due to a stroke of good fortune. On the return of Byron from the East, in 1811, he brought with him what he called 'a great many stanzas 'in Spenser's measure relative to the countries he had 'visited,' and he added, speaking to his friend, Mr. Dallas, 'They are not worth troubling you with, but you shall have 'them all with you if you like.' Dallas was not slow to

literature beyond his own narrow set of acquaintances is to be found at p. 200, vol. i. In the only article he ever wrote, which was on Ford's dramatic works, he had spoken of Charles Lamb as a 'poor maniac,' who it seems once published some detailed scenes of the 'Broken Heart.' He certainly was not aware of the horrible application of these brutal words to Lamb, and it stung him acutely when he learned it. But his defence was that 'all I ever knew or ever heard of Mr. Lamb was merely his name,' and that he had entirely misconceived who and what Lamb was.

discover the beauties of the two first cantos of 'Childe 'Harold,' but it was some time before Lord Byron's obstinate repugnance to publication could be overcome. In the end he gave the manuscript to Dallas, on condition that he should make arrangements with a publisher. Longman had declined to publish 'English Bards and Scotch Re-'viewers,' and was, therefore, not to be applied to. Miller, to whom the poem was first offered, refused it. Then, in a fortunate hour for the house in Fleet Street, Dallas turned to Murray, who had previously published for himself. Indeed, Murray had already expressed to him 'his wish to 'obtain some work of his lordship's.' So 'Childe Harold' was placed in his hands, and, after a brief consultation with Gifford, accepted. But such was the doubt felt of its success, that an edition of only 500 copies was printed, to be followed speedily by as many thousands, and Murray was thought a bold man when he gave Dallas 600*l.* for the copyright.

'Mr. Murray had long desired to make Lord Byron's acquaintance, and now that Mr. Dallas had arranged with him for the publication of the first two cantos of "Childe Harold" he had many opportunities of seeing Byron at his place of business. The first time that he saw him was when he called one day with Mr. Hobhouse in Fleet Street. He afterwards looked in from time to time, while the sheets were passing through the press, fresh from the fencing rooms of Angelo and Jackson, and used to amuse himself by renewing his practice of "Carte et Tierce" with his walking-cane directed against the book shelves, while Murray was reading passages from the poem with occasional ejaculations of admiration, on which Byron would say, "You think that a good idea, do you, Murray?" Then he would fence and lunge with his walking-stick at some special book which he had picked out on the shelves before him. As Murray afterwards said, "I was often very glad to get rid of him!"' (Vol. i. p. 207.)

The acquaintance once made soon ripened into intimacy. Byron found in Murray exactly the publisher and the correspondent that suited him. He was young, he was droll, he was convivial, and entirely free from the stiffness or pedantry of trade; above all, he had the tact to humour the fantastic whims and caprices of the poet, and to devote himself very heartily to his service. Their correspondence began as early as in September 1811, when Murray discreetly begs his author to modify some galling expressions in 'Childe Harold' concerning Spain and Portugal, and some religious sentiments which might drive away orthodox customers; and it was carried on without interruption till the poet's death. Byron's letters to Murray are well known, as they are

published in Moore's life, and form no inconsiderable part of that work—indeed, Murray used to say that he might fairly claim one half of it for his property in these letters, which were of course carefully preserved. But it is extremely remarkable that Byron took as much care of the letters of Murray as Murray did of those of Byron; and, in spite of his desultory habits and his changes of abode, the whole series of letters from Murray, even from this early period, has been found amongst the papers which passed to his executor, Sir John Cam Hobhouse, carefully tied up and docketed by Byron himself. They naturally form a very important addition to the volumes now before us.

The transaction with reference to the Byron Memoirs has been more than once described, and is here related with authentic particulars. Byron gave the Memoirs in 1819 to Moore at Venice to be published after his death, and a continuation followed in December 1820. Moore was authorised to dispose of the reversion of the work, and Murray accordingly purchased the right of publication for 2,000 guineas, which was paid by him. The MS. thus became the absolute property of Murray; but upon the death of Byron it was submitted to Lord John Russell, Gifford, Washington Irving, and Luttrell, who agreed that the publication was not to be desired, and, notwithstanding the right and interest Murray had acquired, he generously consented to its destruction, if such was the deliberate opinion of Byron's friends. The cremation took place in Albemarle Street on May 17, 1824, one month after Byron's death. The sum originally advanced by Murray for the purchase of the manuscript was immediately repaid with interest by Moore, who had borrowed the money from Messrs. Longman for this purpose.

The only conspicuous blunder recorded in Mr. Murray's career was the attempt to found at his own expense a great daily newspaper to be the rival of 'The Times,' and into this adventure he was beguiled by that ingenuous youth Mr. Benjamin Disraeli, not yet of age. Among the miracles performed by the future Earl of Beaconsfield, none is more singular than the fact that he induced a shrewd publisher, twice as old as himself, to plunge into such a speculation. The intimacy between the Disraeli family and the Murrays was of old standing. A note exists of December 22, 1804, which establishes the date of the birth of the future statesman, and Murray used to relate that he was present at the Jewish ceremonies on that occasion. He had therefore

known him from his infancy. The proposal was that Murray should find half the capital, and a Mr. Powles and Disraeli the other half. But the times were evil. It was the moment of the crash of 1825; Mr. Powles disappeared, Disraeli had no money of his own, and the whole loss fell on Murray. Meanwhile the young projector had rushed off to Scotland to obtain the support of Scott and Lockhart, which he failed to do. No editor of the journal was to be found; the 'Representative' languished for half a year at an expense of 26,000*l.*, but, strangely enough, Benjamin let the matter drop at once, and contributed nothing to it either by his capital or by his wits. It was a striking instance of misplaced confidence, and what Byron called 'entusamussy' in a man not easily taken in by others. But Murray was not vindictive, and was of an easy temper; the dispute was eventually made up, and he consented in 1832 to publish for Disraeli the 'Psychological Romance,' known by the name of 'Contarini Fleming,' and a political work called 'Gallo-'mania,' which seems to be now forgotten.

The second volume of this correspondence contains an ample record of Mr. Murray's intimate relations with many of the leading authors of the next twenty years of his life. No book has done more to unveil the mysteries of our own craft, or to disclose the transactions belonging to the commercial history of literature, which have ordinarily been kept private. It is a mine of anecdote, interesting from the eminent character of the writers, and from the extremely capricious results of literary speculation. *Habent sua fata libelli*, and nothing is more certain than the uncertainty of the success or failure of any publication. But through these perilous seas and straits John Murray steered his course with judgment and success. He lived and died without an enemy, standing high in reputation throughout the world as a publisher who was worthily associated with one of the most brilliant periods of English literature.

ART. VI.—1. *Plain Tales from the Hills.* London: 1890.

2. *Wee Willie Winkie; Under the Deodars; The Phantom Rickshaw;* and other Stories. London: 1890.

3. *Soldiers Three; The Story of the Gadsbys; In Black and White.* London: 1890.

4. *The Light that Failed.* London: 1891.

THE present is an age of literary commonplace, and, as a consequence, nothing is more desired or appreciated than a touch of independence or originality. Any writer who strikes upon a fresh vein of thought or treatment secures an eager welcome and achieves an immediate, often an exaggerated, reputation. Of novelists this is especially true, for fiction is the only intellectual food of thousands. The only necessary condition is that the thought or the treatment should be readily understood by the people. Mr. Rudyard Kipling offers this precious gift of novelty, and he presents it in a popular form, which is exactly adapted to a marked fluctuation in literary fashion.

To the mob of gentlemen who write with ease must now be added the mob of ladies. Women, who in the last century would have left behind them a chest full of letters, now consume their literary energies in the production of a shelf full of novels. But there are a thousand volumes to one book, a thousand echoes to one voice. Of the crowd of novels which annually issue from the press scarcely one in a hundred carries the reader out of the beaten track. Mr. Kipling's stories are books, and not merely volumes. When he speaks his words find utterance in a voice and not an echo. He snatches his readers out of themselves and whirls them into a world which is new yet manifestly real. Fresh, strong, rapid and vividly picturesque, his work appeals with forcible directness to a weary novel-reading public, whose vacant hours have long been placarded with the notice, 'All rubbish may be shot here.' But the question remains whether his work is good in itself or only appears to be so by comparison with mediocrities; whether, in other words, its excellence is absolute or merely relative.

A popular novelist is a power to be reckoned with. Many people can write a novel, and most people have done so. Consequently the composition of a novel is often regarded in the same light as a trip to the seaside; and it is a mental 'outing' which, to the reader, gives a change of

scene and can do no harm, and which affords its author an opportunity of ventilating his opinions or caricaturing his friends. To us, on the other hand, the advent of a popular novelist is a matter of public interest and national concern. The novel is one of the most powerful agencies in mental, moral, and social education, and it is of the first importance that so great an instrument for good or evil should be administered by self-respecting hands. It is quite true that the aim of a novel is amusement, that it cannot be judged by strict or high standards of art, that the public does not require them, and that they are not adopted by authors. Suddenly emerging from obscurity to empire, novelists enjoy the license of Bohemia. Independent of the dignity of history, unshackled by the metrical rules of poetry, unrestrained by the dramatic unities, they constitute the Alsatia of literature. They gained their freedom because they were at first regarded as outside the pale of art. Now, although the censorship of society has to a large extent passed into their hands, it is too late to legislate. But if society persists in treating novels as a species of literary dustbin, it ought to take care, for the sake of its own health, that the receptacles are cleaned out at regular intervals. There may be death in a dustbin as well as in a drink shop.

Dr. Johnson's dictum is sturdy common sense—that men do not become highwaymen because Macheath is acquitted on the stage. No one takes to the road for such a cause unless he is more than halfway in that direction already. But there can be no doubt that the weekly budgets of vice and crime, coarsely written, coarsely printed, and coarsely illustrated, which constitute almost the only weekly reading of 'our masters,' rather degrade than elevate their view of life. Nor is a very large part of the literature which circulates in the drawing rooms of the so-called upper classes one whit more elevating in tone and feeling than that which is devoured in public-houses of the East End. Mr. Kipling's responsibility is proportioned to his power, and it is to be regretted that, so far, he has shown too little respect for himself or for his readers. Stories which adopt a uniformly low tone of moral feeling, or which treat adultery as the measles of married life, are not calculated to raise the standard of society. Nor does it answer the ends of morality to mete out poetical justice in the last chapter or the concluding sentence. Only women can plead the excuse that it is the practice of their sex to reserve what is most important for the postscript.

The public prefer to be flattered, rather than surprised, into admiration. Novels are naturally peculiarly susceptible to fluctuations of public caprice. But every revolution in the fashion of fiction represents some wider mental or social change. As the romantic passion of youth rose high, the novel outgrew its childish love of incident. It passed from ideal extravagances to realities of life, while it accumulated the experiences of active manhood. In the meditative spirit of age it exercised its energies on psychological analysis. Now, as some critics assert, in its dotage, it reverts to the taste of its youth, and is spellbound by tales of impossible adventure, or enthralled by the dramatic representation of exciting incidents. Richardson and Fielding, the Jemmy-Jessamy school of sentimentalists, Mrs. Radcliffe, Scott, Mrs. Gore, Dickens, George Eliot, Thackeray, Trollope, and the contemporary masters of fantastic improbabilities represent vicissitudes in mental or social history. Mr. Kipling's work is as different from that of the eighteenth century as the peach-coloured coat of Goldsmith is different from the conventional evening dress of to-day. What fluctuation of fashion is represented in his writings?

A century and a half ago England trembled and wept over a picture painted with the prolix minuteness of the age. The success of 'Clarissa Harlowe' was the first sign of the long deferred reaction against a coarsegrained matter-of-fact realism. A generation passed, and the hotpressed, highly scented 'Rosa Matilda' novel, with its Grandisonian heroes, and for heroines its barber's dummies of impossible sweetness, was in everyone's hands. Its popularity was a manifestation of the sentimentalism of Rousseau. Again a few years, and to the cambric pocket-handkerchief succeeded the dagger. Rose-water sentiment was exchanged for blood-curdling horror. The wave of feeling which found kindred expression in the wild improbabilities of the German novelists was passing over the country. Once more the mysterious bandit shared the fate of Edwin and Angelina, and disappeared from a world in which novelists strove to restore the glories of the past. It was the Gothic revival, and the recoil from the French Revolution. The Apennines were deserted for the Highlands; the feudal fortress rose on the ruins of the turreted Udolfo. Another powerful influence created a fresh demand for a special class of fiction. Almack's and high life and fashionable drawing rooms presented absorbing objects of interest to British matrons, and the productions of the 'silver-fork' school became the hornbooks

of provincial lending libraries. It is the growth of a commercial aristocracy of wealth, the infancy of snobbery, the rise of the moneyed middle classes. On the one side, not a bone of our ancestors rested undisturbed in its grave; on the other, no mystery of the fashionable world remained a secret in the pantry.

> 'Oh, Radcliffe! thou wert once the charmer
> Of maids who sate reading all night;
> Thy heroes were warriors in armour,
> Thy heroines damsels in white;
> But past are such terrible touches;
> Our lips in derision we curl,
> Unless we are told how a Duchess
> Conversed with her cousin the Earl.'

During the past fifty years the novel, with rapidly increasing susceptibility to the slightest change of atmosphere, has represented every fluctuation of social interest. In broad general outline it has obeyed the same laws which may be traced in literary mental history. It passed, like philosophy, from idealism to realism; it appealed to experience; it fell under the domination of science. No longer content to personify vice and virtue in ideal forms, it endeavoured to interpret the real characters of everyday life. It ceased to chronicle only the external results of internal struggles, and sought, instead, to detect the intricate composition of the unseen forces that were arrayed in conflict. Novelists noted, analysed, and arranged the mental and moral dispositions of nationalities, classes, professions, and individuals. Stories vanished; character grew to be all in all. Mademoiselle de Scudéri's 'carte du pays de Tendre' became the experimental science of the realistic novelist.

In the last four or five years a new class of fictitious literature has arisen, which is a symptom of the recoil against the excessive use of the analytical methods of science, and an indication of the reaction against the exclusive rule of a hard prosaic realism. The three-volume novel is one of the institutions of the State; but, like many of its kind, it is in a tottering condition, and its popularity has been undermined by the short story. It is these revolutions in fashion of which Mr. Kipling has taken advantage. A change was needed in matter and also in manner. Mr. Kipling has provided both, and in doing so has satisfied the great want of the novel-reading public.

The world has lost its taste for elaborate studies of character, in which strict methods of psychological analysis were applied

with the rigour of science to the exclusion of the imagination and the starvation of incident. If character were less conventionally monotonous, or if life were less flatly unpicturesque, the subject might yet have triumphed over its treatment, and the matter have pardoned the method. Self-consciousness may prefer the looking-glass to a picture; but it has its limits, which are passed when once self-satisfaction is wounded in its one vulnerable point. A generation of Narcissuses might contemplate their own images in the pool with so self-complacent an admiration, that they 'die of their 'own sweet loveliness.' But the mirror which novelists hold up to view at the end of this present century gives back a soured, cynical, anxious, discontented face, from which the enthusiasm, faith, and hope of youth seem to have entirely fled. The features are no longer pleasing to contemplate. The world wishes to look elsewhere; it breaks the mirror and turns to the picture. Many of Mr. Kipling's contemporaries have discovered these facts, and have endeavoured in various forms to provide the remedy. The fantastic improbabilities of idealism for a time succeeded. But a diet of tipsy-cake will not long satisfy a roast-beef stomach. Ideal extravagances acted like narcotics, and soon ceased to have effect. The world still hankered for realities. Mr. Kipling has succeeded in striking the happy mean. He is a born story-teller. But he draws his tales from the life. He offers us fresh faces, which yet are real human flesh and blood, and he gives us incidents that are facts to be encountered in London streets as well as in the dominions of Prester John.

Mr. Kipling, then, tells stories of real incidents which may, and do, occur in ordinary life. A change was needed in manner as well as in matter, and again Mr. Kipling has met the popular taste. Extreme scientific realism produced highly finished, photographic pictures, carefully observed, and faithfully represented. Poetry, imagination, passion were eliminated. Hard, angular, unmistakeable portraits of uncomely men and women looked out from featureless landscapes painted with pre-Raphaelite minuteness of detail. Nothing was omitted from the picture: if there was a purposeless pin-point of iron-mould on the lady's cuff, it must be rendered; if one twig of a tree was snapped by the wind, it must be described with the same detail as a surgical operation. In another direction art had become so sentimentalised, or so crippled by fashion, that it had lost its hold on truth. A general softness of outline produced an indistinctness which served to hide the badness of the

drawing; the lines were so swathed, that the sense of form was lost, and the whole was so highly varnished that the features were invisible. Pedantry hampered independence; susceptibilities disguised reality; conventionalities intercepted directness. The world looked for men, and found the dress of the day; it sought for women, and beheld their rights. Artists communicated something of their own toil, or their own hesitation, to the reader. Where the pictures were produced by an infinitude of small strokes, to appreciate the effect more time and study were required than men are disposed to bestow on works of fiction written for their amusement. If, on the other hand, the novelist was himself infirm or timid of purpose, or if he lacked the necessary training, his drawing was flabby, his lines blurred, his foreground featureless, and the whole work suffused with a haze of gentle indistinctness. Against these methods of treatment idealists protested by painting creation in a blaze of colours, which never were seen on land or sea. The effects might be, and often are, attractive, but they were plainly impossible. The novelty soon wore off. Mr. Kipling has again hit the fortunate mean. He adopts a method of pictorial treatment, of which daring directness, sharpness of outline, and naked reality, are the characteristics, and which only errs in the opposite direction to a prudish delicacy. His bold dashing sketches of real nature, with their masses of colour concentrated on exactly the right spot, enable him to make objects picturesque which more finished work would reveal in their true ungainliness and squalor. If labour has been bestowed upon the art, it is successfully concealed. The apparent ease with which the effects are produced reacts upon the reader. And with the eye of the born artist he also possesses his reticence. Concentrating himself upon the one point which he wishes to bring out, he suffers nothing to distract his attention from it. His scenes are painted in the minimum of space, and with the maximum of vividness. The picture is given as it were in a flash of lightning, and he who travels by express train may read it at a glance. The gift of telling a short story, which is complete in itself and does not appear to be a fragment of a larger whole, is a rare one, and Mr. Kipling possesses it to a very remarkable degree of perfection.

Mr. Kipling, therefore, is fortunate both in his matter and in his manner: in his matter because it is new, yet real, and deals with incident in a narrative form; in his manner because it is rapid, direct, concentrated, and fitted for an age

in which all who wish to read wish also to run. In both respects he has exactly hit a real literary want. He is content to tell a story without reference to ethical purpose, and without pausing to indicate the relations of cause and effect which exist between the characters and conduct of his actors. It would, however, be grossly unjust to attribute all his success to a happy chance, or even to the keen-sighted intuition which detected the drift of fashion and discovered the exact shape in which public caprice could be best satisfied. Mr. Kipling has gifts which would have obtained him a fair share of success, even had he elected, both in his matter and his manner, to swim against the stream. But all his talents would not have secured him so rapid and immediate a success, if the relations between author and audience were not those of supply and demand. At present it is our opinion that the praise bestowed upon Mr. Kipling's work has been extravagant. His merits still lie rather in the promise than in the performance. His work has been praised to excess, partly because his talents are indisputably great, partly, and mainly, because he has caught the tide at a turn.

Over Mr. Kipling there is no need to repeat Canning's exclamation over an embryo orator, 'I wish to Heaven that 'young man would risk himself.' Audacity is one of his characteristics. In choice of subjects and in manner of treatment he adopts the 'hit or miss' style. Few authors who have been so short a time before the public have ever produced such abundant material for a critic. It is a good sign. Careless cleverness—not that Mr. Kipling is ever careless—is better than careful dullness, and extravagance is generally more hopeful than commonplace. Mr. Kipling has published some seventy stories, a novel, and a volume of verse. With the latter we are not concerned. Mr. Kipling's verses are the parerga of a man whose serious business of life is prose fiction. Each crisply, tersely told story illustrates, with more or less force, Mr. Kipling's gift of dramatic representation. However trivial or slight the incident, it is almost always effectively rendered. What the reader is intended to see, he cannot help seeing with vivid clearness. Sharp and distinct, the figures stand out in bold relief. Nothing is allowed to distract attention, or to weaken the force of the impression. Yet we cannot help thinking that Mr. Kipling would have been wiser, if he had put two-thirds of the stories into the fire, or had left the larger number undisturbed in the comparative oblivion of the Indian journals in which they originally appeared. No doubt the temptation to seize a favourable

turn in the market, or to make the fat years pay for the lean, is a strong one; but Mr. Kipling should have called to mind his own philosophy, and remembered that 'notoriety is 'windy diet for a young colt,' and that to 'fall under the 'damnation of the check-book' is 'worse than death.'

Short stories appear under the most favourable circumstances when they are published one by one at considerable intervals. A collection of them cannot be brought out under the same conditions. They will not be read singly. No interval will elapse between the perusal of each. The test to which they must be subjected in a collected form is a severe one, and only the best pass through the ordeal successfully. If a dozen of these tales are read continuously, the reader is exasperated by the jerkiness of the style, wearied by the repetition of the same tricks, disgusted with the frivolous, sordid, vicious meanness of the life that they depict. One out of the number may, perhaps, impress itself on the memory as excellent; but the remaining eleven resemble a street of smart suburban tenements, all built on the same plan, all exactly the same size, and nearly all, it may be added, defectively drained. If Mr. Kipling lives to achieve the reputation which we believe to be within his grasp, he will regret, for instance, that he has not consigned to the flames the series contained in 'Under the Deodars,' with the exception of 'Only a Subaltern;' the whole of 'Black and White,' which for English readers is devoid of interest; and at least three-fourths of 'Plain Tales from the 'Hills.' We even hope that, as he rereads 'The Gadsbys' in the light of a matured judgement, he may himself writhe with the same intolerable nausea which its heavily loaded pathos has inflicted upon others. Similarly we trust that 'The Phantom Rickshaw,' with its abrupt intrusion into everyday life of a crudely material supernaturalism, and its rude collision between the invisible and the sensible, may in the future move him to laughter instead of tremor.

Mr. Kipling's stories may be divided into three classes—tales of Indian society, tales of the barrack room, and tales of child life. In our opinion the literary merits of these three classes are very different, though all three possess the distinctive charm of direct, vivid, and lively narrative. The first class comprises a collection of 'queer stories,' of the same order of merit as those which appear in the pages of a 'society weekly.' They are uniformly trivial, vulgar, and smart, though not a few are decidedly clever. The second class comprises a series of studies of the British private in

peace and war, which, in their peculiar style, are masterly productions. For a parallel to them we must look to the cunning hand which drew the portraits of the two Wellers, Dick Swiveller, and all the knotty, eccentric portraits of the many-caped figures who haunt the yards, bars, and parlours of English inns. Dickens was the Columbus of Cockney-land; Mr. Kipling is the Columbus of the barrack room. The third class contains a number of slight sketches of child life, which are certain to gain a cheaply earned popularity for the author, but which are, with one exception, artistically of little value.

The world is the novelist's oyster. He has but to open it with his pen. In his stories of Anglo-Indian society, Mr. Kipling has either had bad luck, or is afflicted with a morbid taste. The oysters are unpleasantly tainted. If the story is worth the telling, if its subject is some deed of simple heroism, some touch of tender feeling in an otherwise degraded nature, or some incident of a stirring kind, Mr. Kipling can tell it inimitably well; but if it is some episode of social life which had better perhaps not be told, or which, if told at all, should be handled with delicacy, Mr. Kipling conspicuously fails. The professional instincts of the paragraphist of a society newspaper seem to overpower the natural instincts of refinement and good breeding. Life in the hill stations of India *may* be vicious, frivolous, and mean, and so far the author may shelter himself under the plea that all which must of necessity be studied is fit for spectacular presentment. It would still remain a question whether a showman is entitled to avail himself of the cloak of the physician. But apart from the faults that may justly be attributed to the subject rather than to the author, Mr. Kipling's work is pervaded with gratuitous touches of vulgarity and coarseness, which may possibly lead to the ruin of his reputation. He seems to regard life from the point of view of 'Truth' or 'The 'World.' He cannot help treating society as the material for 'copy,' and its scandals as the ingredients from which spicy dishes may be cooked with the aid of hints, insinuations, and exaggerations. Running the eye in the most cursory manner through the bulk of the stories, the reader is struck by the influence of modern journalistic methods. They only require the sensational headings which appear to be so irresistibly attractive to a certain class of readers—'Revelations in a Military Mess,' or 'A Colonel's Wife in 'Difficulties,' or 'Suicide of a Subaltern—*cherchez la Femme*.' Unless Mr. Kipling emancipates himself from the thraldom

of the society press, acquires a greater knowledge of the world and of character than is supplied by 'Truth' or 'The 'World,' and ceases to regard life from the point of view of the social paragraphist, the excellent work of which we believe him capable will never be accomplished.

It is a relief to turn from the stories, in which a string of silly, worthless, weak, or wicked creatures, without any redeeming features in their lives or characters, do duty for gentlemen and gentlewomen. Conventional sirens and conventional swine play their accustomed parts. But these social dramas have little appearance of first-hand observation. Has Mr. Kipling any real experience of society of this kind, or is his knowledge of it only derived from such incidents as find their way into newspapers? The stories have scarcely a touch of that individuality which belongs to pictures drawn from life. They are put together with considerable cleverness to satisfy an ill-regulated taste for scandalous gossip. For the honour of human nature, and of the Anglo-Indian in particular, we believe them to be libels, and internal evidence inclines us to think that our author writes merely from hearsay, and not from observed facts. Yet even in the stories in which the human figures are most uninteresting or contemptible, and in which the touches of vulgarity and coarseness are most conspicuous, the incidents are handled with peculiar skill. Mr. Kipling rarely fails in perception of the telling points in a situation, tact in selection of effective details, liveliness of narrative, and a considerable infusion of humour. But there are stories in which all the strong points of the author are concentrated, and from which his peculiar faults are excluded. If Mr. Kipling had saved from the flames all the tales in which his admirable Three Musketeers appear, 'The Drums of the Fore and Aft,' 'The Story of Muhammad Din,' and a few others, he would have produced one book instead of three volumes; but the book would have been one of which he might be legitimately proud, and which would contain some of the strongest and freshest work that has appeared for several years in English fiction.

European society in India does not always present a pleasing or dignified aspect, and Mr. Kipling applies his caustic pretty freely to the pedantry of official life, to the vanities and vices of a fashionable cantonment, and to the rough and ready humour of the British soldier abroad. But he reserves the finer touches of his pen for his sketches of Indian life and native character. There he has no equal.

No other writer has, since Colonel Meadows Taylor, shown the same sympathy and regard for the childlike simplicity, the patient fidelity, and sensibility of the Hindoo; and we esteem these lifelike pictures of the world in which Mr. Kipling spent his early life to be the best part of his work. Other scenes he describes by invention or reflected light; but these native incidents are reality.

In 'Soldiers Three,' 'The Three Musketeers,' 'The Taking of Lungtungpen,' 'The Daughter of the Regiment,' 'The Madness of Private Ortheris,' and 'The Drums of the Fore and Aft,' Mr. Kipling shows himself possessed to a marked degree of the creative gifts of intuitive sympathy. If the day should ever come when he throws himself into English social life of any grade with the same power which he has here employed on Tommy Atkins, we may find in him a novelist whose works will be everywhere recognised as works of genius. Hitherto the British private, if painted at all, might have sat for his portrait to the British nursemaid as he appears to her sentimental fancy on parade or in the parks. Mr. Kipling paints the real man, with his natural blackguardism and coarse animalism, softened and redeemed by a rough chivalry, by unexpected gleams of tenderness, and by a strong feeling of comradeship towards his brothers in arms. Under the three types of a Londoner, an Irishman, and a Yorkshireman, he has drawn to the life the 'bloomin', eight-anna, dog-stealin', Gawd-forsaken, beer-swillin' Tommy, with a number instead of a decent name.' The mimicry is admirable with which he has caught the brogue of Mulvaney, the Cockney idiom of Ortheris, the north-country burr of Learoyd. But the studies go far beyond the mere mimicry of superficial peculiarities. They add to our knowledge of human nature. The representation carries with it a conviction of its substantial truth. The sentiments which the three musketeers express are those which stir the heart of the British private: he thinks as Mr. Kipling has thought for him. In thought, speech, and feeling, Jakin and Lew are real representative drummer-boys. Nor does Mr. Kipling, in spite of some pardonable exaggerations, often make the mistake into which George Eliot sometimes fell. In teaching the world that common life and homely modes of existence may be made interesting, she was apt to turn the village pothouse into a Socratic symposium. Mr. Kipling's heroes are not wise beyond their station; they do not speak like sages, or squander epigrams with Eastern prodigality. Their wit, which is ready and

abundant, is the shrewd mother-wit of men who have knocked about the world, and lived their lives in the give-and-take of a barrack room. Yet two minute exceptions may possibly be taken to the dramatic truth of the representation. When Ortheris produces his gingerade for the guard on the night of a sultry June, would Mulvaney have asked, 'Where did ye get it, ye *Machiavel*?' And again, in the same excellent story of 'With the Main Guard,' Mulvaney concludes his vivid narrative with a remark to the author: 'Egah! I've blandandhered thim through the night 'somehow, but can thim that help others help thimselves? 'Answer me that, Sorr!' The touch raises Private Mulvaney to heroic proportions. It secures for him an appreciation which he deserves. But we cannot help feeling that the author's affection for his creation—an affection which we fully share—has carried him too far, and that the touch is misplaced. We adhere to the belief that Mulvaney talked for the pleasure of talking, and the suggestion of an object, unselfish though it be, destroys the charm of his natural flow, and arouses suspicions where all should be mutual confidence.

As with the men, so with their lives, and especially with their lives on active service. Mr. Kipling's war pictures are marvellously picturesque, vivid, and dramatic. Here again his creative gift of intuitive sympathy is admirably employed. His battle scenes have all the brutality, movement, confusion, and ferocity of reality. The same overpowering sense of literal truth is produced, which is created by the single figures of Mulvaney and his companions. Where colour is needed, he is not afraid to use it. His strong rapid strokes are the well-placed effective touches of a master who omits every redundant detail. He exhibits with most graphic power the confused mass of men who are not manœuvring with civilised foes according to the rules of war, but are fighting for their lives against maddened savages, whether Afghans or Arabs; or paints with unrivalled force the panic of a raw regiment of boys attacked by the desperate Ghazis. Here are no pictures of Tommy Atkins as he is coloured above the official notices of the advantages offered by the British army to intending recruits—standing at attention with polished boots, unspecked uniform, pipeclayed accoutrements, and a general air of well-fed contentment. The difference between the ideal and the real is that which is forcibly described in 'The Light that 'Failed.' The imaginary is the chromo-lithographed mili-

tary pattern plate. The actual is a 'flushed, dishevelled, 'bedevilled scallawag, with his helmet at the back of his 'head, and the living fear of death in his eye, and the blood 'oozing out of a cut over his ankle-bone.' Passages might be selected from 'The Drums of the Fore and Aft,' or from 'With the Main Guard,' which would as effectively illustrate Mr. Kipling's power as a battle-painter. But we prefer to give an extract from 'The Light that Failed.' The superiority of the second chapter, in which an episode of the Soudan campaign is described, to the rest of the novel shows that Mr. Kipling is at present only master of one side of life and character. No one can, we think, fail to recognise the singular force and vigour of the following description of a desert fight.

'All had fought in this manner many times before, and there was no novelty in the entertainment: always the same hot and stifling formation, the smell of dust and leather, the same boltlike rush of the enemy, the same pressure on the weakest side of the square, the few minutes of desperate hand-to-hand scuffle, and then the silence of the desert, broken only by the yells of those whom the handful of cavalry attempted to pursue. They had grown careless. The camel-guns spoke at intervals, and the square slouched forward amid the protests of the camels. Then came the attack of three thousand men who had not learned from books that it is impossible for troops in close order to attack against breech-loading fire. A few dropping shots heralded their approach, and a few horsemen led, but the bulk of the force was naked humanity, mad with rage, and armed with the spear and the sword. The instinct of the desert, where there is always much war, told them that the right flank of the square was the weakest, for they swung clear of the front. The camel-guns shelled them as they passed, and opened for an instant lanes through their midst, most like those quick-closing vistas in a Kentish hop-garden seen when the train races by at full speed; and the infantry fire, held till the opportune moment, dropped them in close-packed hundreds. No civilised troops in the world could have endured the hell through which they came, the living leaping high to avoid the dying who clutched at their heels, the wounded cursing and staggering forward till they fell—a torrent black as the sliding water above a mill-dam—full on the right flank of the square. Then the line of the dusty troops and the faint blue desert sky overhead went out in rolling smoke, and the little stones on the heated ground and the tinder-dry clumps of scrub became matters of surpassing interest, for men measured their agonised retreat and recovery by these things, counting mechanically and hewing their way back to chosen pebble and branch. There was no semblance of any concerted fighting. For aught the men knew, the enemy might be attempting all four sides of the square at once. Their business was to destroy what lay in front of them, to bayonet in the back those who passed over them, and, dying, to drag down the slayer till he could be

knocked on the head by some avenging gun-butt. . . . There was a rush from without, the short *hough-hough* of the stabbing spears, and a man on a horse, followed by thirty or forty others, dashed through, yelling and hacking. The right flank of the square sucked in after them, and the other sides sent help. The wounded, who knew that they had but a few hours more to live, caught at the enemy's feet and brought them down, or, staggering to a discarded rifle, fired blindly into the scuffle that raged in the centre of the square' (pp. 29–32).

In his military studies Mr. Kipling is seen at his best. But his powers are not confined within a single groove. His pictures of child life are certain to be popular. Here, too, he has achieved success. But the subject is so much easier, and its treatment approximates so closely to a trick, that the artistic value of the triumph is, as a test of latent or revealed power, comparatively slight. Child pictures are uniformly comic or pathetic. Either form of presentation is easy, but Mr. Kipling prefers the latter. The helplessness and weakness of children, placed in adverse circumstances, make a natural and powerful appeal to sympathy. The pathos is ready made, and it gains in effect the more the author stands aside. But the fact that Mr. Kipling should have devoted so much of his time to the study of child life affords some subject for reflection. Many a young man can describe his existence at school, but very few retain anything but vague impressions of childhood. Either these child stories are mere 'potboilers,' which a man who possesses the knack of drawing children can multiply indefinitely, with the certainty of commanding a ready sale, or they have some deeper meaning. We incline to the latter surmise, though we do not credit Mr. Kipling with any exalted scruples against profiting by the popular taste. The lot of a child, sent home from India, separated from parents, and consigned to the care of strangers, may be cruelly hard. Even at its best the position possesses elements of tragedy. It is also an experience that imprints the events of childhood clearly and indelibly on the youthful mind. It is a theme to which Mr. Kipling recurs more than once. The experience of Dick and Maisie in 'The 'Light that Failed,' at the hands of Mrs. Jennett, closely resembles that of Punch, under the roof of Aunty Rosa, in 'Baa, Baa, Blacksheep.' Are the details to some degree autobiographical? If Mr. Kipling has himself passed through this ordeal, his recurrence to the study of child life, and to this particular phase of it, is explained. If, again, Mr. Kipling was thus deprived of the refining and softening

influence of home, and was left to make his own way as best he could among strangers, the fact would go far to explain the intrusion into many of his stories of hard, sour, cynical touches, which are repulsive in themselves, and which, in a young and successful man, would otherwise appear to be an unworthy affectation.

Stories of child life are, as we have said, easy compositions, because the sentiment to which the author appeals is ready made. But making every necessary deduction on this score, 'The Story of Muhammad Din' is a pathetic masterpiece. It is, in our opinion, the gem of this series, and it can scarcely be read without a lump in the throat. 'Wee 'Willie Winkie' belongs to the type of comic child heroes, for which personally we have little taste. 'Punch' is, perhaps, too much elaborated, and the misery of his surroundings seems exaggerated in order to heighten the effect. But the tiny plump figure of the son of the 'Khitmatgar,' in its 'ridiculously inadequate shirt, which came, perhaps, half-'way down the tubby stomach,' goes irresistibly straight to the heart. Without Muhammad Din, we should have hesitated whether, or not, to include pathos among Mr. Kipling's literary gifts; with it before us, we cannot deny that he possesses it in a marked degree. In 'The Gadsbys' he attempted to be intensely pathetic, and, in the opinion of the public, he apparently succeeded, if the number of editions through which the work has passed affords a true criterion of popularity. Dickens, before Mr. Kipling, perceived that certain classes of society were 'sad for very 'wantonness,' and to meet their requirements prepared a whole stock of death scenes, adapted to the wants of every age. In 'The Gadsbys' Mr. Kipling follows the same methods, and incurs the same condemnation. The child wife and the big blubbering dragoon are old stage properties; their respective parts can be predicted with almost absolute certainty; and the whole story suggests Dickens in his worst and most wilful excesses of tawdry sentimentality. Only the most manly of men could depict such scenes with success, and they would be the very last to make the attempt. Grief, which is dumb or self-restrained, is always dignified and pathetic; descriptions of its manifestations produce the opposite emotion, and in proportion as its details are spun out, emphasised, underlined, and black-leaded, they create disgust. In 'The Gadsbys' Mr. Kipling showed, either a complete ignorance of the true nature of real pathos, or, as we are more inclined to believe, an

accurate perception of what would pay with the public. In 'The Story of Muhammad Din' the subject is perfectly treated. Its baroness is far more effective than elaboration. The child does its own work far better than any words of the author acting as its showman. The little figure is perfectly clear and distinct from the moment it is found in the Sahib's room till it is seen for the last time in the carriage drive. We would rather have written 'Little 'Muhammad Din' than three-fourths of the other 'Plain 'Tales from the Hills.'

Besides his shorter stories Mr. Kipling has written a one-volume novel. It is a very uneven book; the parts, especially the campaigning scenes, are infinitely better than the whole. But a work which displays the same graphic power of presentation, the same condensed vigour, the same liveliness of narrative, that characterised the slighter sketches, is necessarily of no ordinary kind. The canvas is larger; it is filled with more figures; its background is more extended. But none of the work is slurred or shirked. It is firm, clear, and strong. His short stories have been to him what line work is to the artist. They have taught him form and drawing. On the other hand, the book exhibits a fault to which Mr. Kipling is always inclined. It is needlessly hard and gratuitously brutal. If some necessary truth can only be purchased by a touch of what we call brutality, we prefer the truth to its evasion. But Mr. Kipling goes out of his way to defy conventionalities deliberately and without any gain in the way of truth. Violence is not vigour, nor are the touches which create disgust always strong. On this point we believe that Mr. Kipling has, or conceives himself to have, a mission. No doubt a mass of twaddle has been, and is, daily talked about the dignity of Art, and most men will sympathise with Mr. Kipling in his crusade against the pompous pedantry of art managers, who 'think with 'their boots and read with their elbows,' and who demand that truth should be modified to suit the feelings of their subscribers. But there may be as much affectation in antagonism as there is in deference to conventionalities. The pupil of Verestchagin with, or without, water may be just as unnatural as the most sleek disciple of the æsthetic 'Postlethwaite.' If Mr. Kipling's brutality is the fruit of his hatred of existing artistic products, it is an affectation, and before long will be discovered, with the result that some newer eccentricity will eventually take his place. If it is the result of his sincere convictions, it stands on a different

footing, and it only remains to be proved whether, or not, Mr. Kipling is right.

What we mean by brutality may be illustrated from numerous incidents or expressions in Mr. Kipling's works. His East End story is one long exemplification of the gratuitously brutal method. We select, however, as an illustration of our meaning, a passage from 'The Light that 'Failed.' It is an episode in the desert fight from which we have already quoted a powerful passage. In the confusion of the struggle, Dick's friend 'Torpenhow had gone 'down under an Arab whom he had tried to "collar low," 'and was turning over and over with his captive, feeling for 'the man's eyes.' The next moment we are told that he 'had shaken himself clear of his enemy, and rose wiping his 'thumb on his trousers.' If such an occurrence really took place in actual warfare it would have been omitted from most descriptions, because its brutality upsets the due proportion of the different scenes described. Mr. Kipling, apparently thinking that the omission is a weak deference to the susceptibility of the British public, inserts the episode, and thereby spoils the subordination of the parts to the whole, on which the excellence of a description largely depends. The construction of 'The Light that Failed' is spoilt by a similar spirit of defiance. A fair working definition of a good novel is the combination of interesting actors with a well-constructed plot which developes their characters. The fault of Mr. Kipling's novel is that none of the actors make the slightest appeal in any way to our feelings. They are all so uninteresting that we cannot bring ourselves to care in the remotest degree to learn their fates.

The story opens with the childhood of the hero and heroine, Dick and Maisie. They are less unpleasant as children than at any other period of their careers, but they grow up profoundly selfish. The trial of their selfishness is made the pivot of the plot. An interval of ten years elapses between the parting in childhood and their subsequent meeting. In the interval Dick has achieved a brilliant success as an artist, while Maisie, who is ambitious of the same artistic fame, has totally failed. Dick wishes to marry Maisie; Maisie only wishes to make him useful in the attainment of her ambition. Dick goes suddenly blind at the very moment when his fame is secured. What will Maisie do? In the story, as told in 'Lippincott's Magazine,' she abandons her own plans of life, and devotes herself to the blind lover whom she had refused, when he was in possession of his eye-

sight. In the story as originally conceived by the writer, she wishes him 'goodbye,' and goes her own way. There can be no question that a woman of the character attributed to Maisie would have adopted the latter course, and that Mr. Kipling was right in his original conception of the story. The termination, given at the request of the magazine editor, is false to the actors. But the feeling which prompted a demand for a change in the catastrophe was guided by a correct perception of the weak point in the story. Mr. Kipling has chosen to divest hero and heroine of every vestige of personal interest. Dick's blindness does not excite pity, much less sympathy. Maisie's cold-blooded desertion of him in his hour of need is so much a matter of course that it excites no indignation, and even no surprise. Thus a well-constructed plot, effective situations, and a natural pathos, are squandered, in order that Mr. Kipling may show defiance of what he would call the conventionalities of Art. He will not do what other people would have done, lest he should sacrifice his own independence. In this he is consistent with himself, and with the philosophy which he puts into the mouth of Dick, who seems to be the expositor of his creator's own views and methods of work. It was the unconventionality, independence, and daring directness, of Mr. Kipling's work which gave him much of his vogue. No one desires that he should sacrifice the methods by which he obtained his popularity as soon as it is attained. But here, as elsewhere, he confounds a protest against rules dictated by fluctuations of taste with a revolt against principles which never alter. If Mr. Kipling does not recognise the distinction between the mutable laws of popular caprice and the unchanging principles of art, he will never rise beyond a fashion which the public will discard as soon as they are familiar with the touch.

In Mr. Kipling's short stories his brief, abrupt, truncated sentences are excellently adapted to the rapidity of his style. His condensed pictures imperatively demand a concentrated form of presentation. But where the distance to be covered is longer, other qualities are required besides those of speed. For a long journey the humdrum revolutions of a coach wheel are more satisfactory to travellers, and lead more certainly to the goal, than the dazzling coruscations of a St. Catherine's wheel. 'The Light that Failed' therefore affords the best test of the value of Mr. Kipling's style. Mannerisms which are interesting or amusing in casual acquaintances become irritating when the companionship is

more lasting. And in 'The Light that Failed' we wish for more repose than Mr. Kipling's jerky, and somewhat jaunty, manner allows to his readers. Yet, in spite of its occasionally irritating defects, the style is characteristic of the author, and, alike in its merits and defects, is in keeping with the peculiarities of his work.

It is the style of a man who writes after the light of nature, and who has not formed himself on the study of classic models. In form it is very different from the style of Dickens, but in spirit it has close affinities to 'Barnaby 'Rudge.' Both writers aimed at painting pictures which should arrest the most careless eye, or driving home a point to the dullest understanding. Both endeavoured to express themselves in the most emphatic language; both abound in racy idioms caught from the lips of living men; the freshness of unconventionality is common to both. Mr. Kipling sees clearly, rapidly, and distinctly; his eye passes over immaterial details and fastens firmly upon salient features; he realises his visions to himself with marked vividness. All these gifts are communicated to a picture-making style, the merits of which are that it is terse, lively, pointed, and distinct. Mr. Kipling never wastes his words. Writers are often apt to make the mistake which Napoleon noticed in Talma's rendering of the part of Nero. 'You gesticulate 'too much,' said the Emperor to the great actor. 'You 'declaim too vehemently. Despots know that they have only 'to speak, and their words are obeyed.' Mr. Kipling neither declaims nor gesticulates. He seeks for the most pointed expression of his thoughts, produces his effects with the least possible expenditure of language, and leaves the words to make themselves felt by their own inherent force. He knows that a single stroke well aimed returns a better result than a score which are delivered at large; that one touch of colour, or of light and shade, rightly placed, is enough, and that a single word in the mouth of the wise is worth a dictionary on the lips of a fool. He has a horror of indefiniteness, detests generalities, and is intolerant of vague abstractions. Every substantive gives form and substance to the picture; every adjective adds to it individuality; every verb places the lines in some exactly marked position. Every word is at once definite, sharply accentuated, precise, and concrete. At the same time his quick perception of latent analogies gives him a power which is akin to that of American humourists, and the collocation or illustration of his ideas, though rarely forced or unnatural, enables him to

produce those unexpected turns of thought on which the liveliness of literary manner so largely depends. Such a style lends itself readily to epigram, for epigrams come readily to a man who sees clearly, comprehensively, rapidly, and expresses his visions with corresponding definiteness and concentration. On the other hand, Mr. Kipling's manner is calculated to display the conspicuous faults of his matter. Unless it is regulated by a correct and refined taste, it readily degenerates from genuine cleverness into mere smartness and downright vulgarity; it is naturally akin to a flashy pretentiousness of expression which seems designed to advertise the talents of the author; and, if the epigram is missed, the very failure reveals the flippancy of the thought and language.

To sum up what has been said. Mr. Kipling's work shows, in some respects, extraordinary promise; but his actual performances have been extravagantly praised. He is a master of the form of short stories, of incident, and in this direction the tide of literary fashion has recently turned. He has shown himself, though the field is at present limited, to be possessed of no ordinary gift of pathos, and of the more precious gift of creative sympathy. He can transform himself at will into the soul of the British private or the drummer boy. But his experience of other sides of life is still so narrow that he foists off upon his readers as reality a view of society which is apparently taken from journals whose existence depends on their capacity to overhear and exaggerate the gossip of the servants' hall. If Mr. Kipling learns more of the real world, or if he can acquire a measure of the joviality and catholicity which made Dickens the master of the humbler grades of life, he will do some of the best work that the present generation has yet seen. But even here a danger lies before him. His powers will be comparatively wasted if he does not abandon his mistaken mission of convincing the British public that a literal coarseness of treatment and a gratuitously rough touch are necessary to emancipate art from the leadingstrings of pedantry.

ART. VII.—1. *London, Past and Present: its History, Associations and Traditions.* By HENRY B. WHEATLEY, F.A.S. Based upon the 'Handbook of London,' by the late Peter Cunningham. London: 1891.

2. *A History of London.* By W. J. LOFTIE, B.A., F.A.S. With Maps and Illustrations. Third edition. London: 1891.

3. *The 'Crace Collection' of Maps and Views of Old London,* British Museum.

THERE is something more than remarkable, something almost portentous, in the growth and developement of London—not only in extent, but in architectural character—since the commencement of the present century, and more especially during the last forty years. It seems as if the ancient English capital, after slowly expanding through many centuries into the large, but still not abnormally extended city into which the two cities of London and Westminster were gradually united, had in its latter days made an altogether new commencement of growth, pushing out its streets and buildings on all sides till it has become not so much a city as, in its official definition, a 'metropolitan area.' The small map appended by Mr. Loftie to his 'History of London,' coloured so as to show the space occupied by the city (in the general, not the official, sense of the word) in the years 1580, 1745, 1818, 1831, 1867, and 1881, shows under the latter date an area which leaves the sixteenth century London but a small red spot in the middle of its superficies. In 1745 London was bounded westward by Park Lane, eastward by the eastern boundary of the Roman City, and only just overlapped the Oxford Street line northwards. To-day it is a tract of houses spreading over a large extent of country, an irregular circle of some twelve miles in diameter, with an eastern extension considerably beyond that general radius; and the recent census shows that the population of the city and its environs has increased in the last decade in the same gigantic proportions. We may trace the expansion of London more in detail, and its changes in architectural appearance, from the succession of maps and views in the Crace Collection, now housed in the print room of the British Museum; a collection of such interest, as constituting a graphic history of London since the beginning of the sixteenth century, that it deserves to be exhibited in a large public gallery. Laurie

and Whittle's map of 1800 shows us the London of the commencement of the century. It is a long, irregular parallelogram bounded on the west by Edgware Road and Park Lane. The ground north of the Oxford Street line shows a fringe of building, but leaving wide open spaces between that and 'the New Road from Paddington to Islington' (now the Marylebone and Euston Roads).

In endeavouring to form some conception of the outward appearance of the principal portions of the London of the early part of the present century, we cannot begin better than by considering its aspect as seen along the banks of the historic river, though it is a thing of beauty and joy no longer. No more do fairly embowered private gardens, running down from Whitehall and the Strand, overshadow the banks of a clear stream; no more could 'riparian owners' between Westminster and Waterloo bridges find that pleasure in swimming in it which was so seductive to a lordly owner in the last century that the Earl of Chesterfield directed a letter 'to the Earl of Pembroke, in the Thames, 'over against Whitehall.' Yet within a more recent period than that of the natatory earl, the Thames side, in and about the neighbourhood of Westminster, was evidently full of picturesque charm. In a sketch in 1808 we find, from the Surrey side, Westminster Abbey and the old Houses of Parliament nearly shut out from view by trees clustering to the water's edge. Millbank was a rural spot in 1810, and a view of Vauxhall Bridge in 1819 shows a grove of trees where the recently enlarged railway station now stands. In front of Lambeth Palace was a narrow roughly paved wharf with wooden railings, over which figures leaned in a *dolce far niente* fashion, looking down on the narrow beach and the groups of boats below. The *far niente* may still be indulged on the Albert Embankment, but the *dolce* has fled. Daniell's charming view up the Thames (1805), from a point just below Westminster Bridge, looks up into a pure country landscape, and Buckley's pretty water-colour drawing of Whitehall Stairs in 1831 shows a stately house with its garden walls and rich masses of trees overhanging the water, the 'stairs' being reached by a narrow passage between two walls, as now in so many hamlets and villages on the upper Thames. Somerset House rises straight out of the water, the broad central arch of its basement half submerged. This should be borne in mind in looking at the building now from the Thames Embankment; the basement was designed

to rise from the water, and does not explain itself in its present position.

Approaching London by the Knightsbridge way we should have found, in the opening decade of the century, a semi-rural or suburban road, a turnpike with a wooden house near the entrance to Kensington Palace, and beside it the low tiled building of the old cavalry barracks. The Hyde Park entrances were common iron gates fixed in iron standards. At Knightsbridge was the old picturesque Rose and Crown Inn, shown in a drawing of Shepherd's as late as 1857. At Hyde Park Corner was another turnpike, and the street houses in Piccadilly, here and further on, were such as we should now expect to find in the smaller streets about Camden Town and Hampstead Road. Opposite Hyde Park Gate was the prim old brick St. George's Hospital (formerly Lanesborough House), but facing towards the main road, not, like the present one, towards Grosvenor Place. At Cumberland Gate was a starved-looking brick arched gateway designed by Sir John Soane, where Nash's Marble Arch now stands. Near Berkeley Street was the old Three Kings Inn, another of the old picturesque courtyard inns; but not much further on we should have come to the heavy monumental gateway of Burlington House, and had the gates been open might have caught a glimpse of the double sweep of the celebrated semicircular colonnade, the component parts of which are now going to ruin on the river bank at Battersea.

Looking down St. James's Street, in passing, we should have seen the vista closed by St. James's Palace, as at present, but none of the present clubhouses, save Brooks's, that venerable haunt of the Whig party, built from Holland's designs about 1777–8, and Boodle's, built some ten years earlier from the designs of Adam. White's existed long before as a club; but the front, designed by James Wyatt, was 'restored,' we know not precisely to what extent, in the middle of the present century. Regent Street dates from early in the century, 1813—one of the few streets in London laid out, like some prominent streets of later date in Paris, according to one comprehensive design—and is less changed than most London streets of its comparative antiquity. Nash was the genius who devised this piece of plaster pomposity, which was thought so much of that some painstaking draughtsman has left a fully drawn-out elevation of the whole of the two sides of the street from top to bottom, now in the Crace Collection; this was made some

time later than the formation of the street, as it shows the front of the Hanover Chapel, designed by Cockerell ten or twelve years later, the only bit of real architecture in the street, which some wiseacres want to remove now because it is not much frequented as a church. A church of any architectural merit, if no longer necessary for its original purpose, should be turned to some such public use as a museum, rather than pull it down.

Looking down Regent Street, however, we should have seen the vista closed by the open colonnaded screen of the courtyard of Carlton House, with its entrance gateways at either side, and the house itself—prim, square, with a central pediment rising in the rear—central with the axis of the street named after its then princely inhabitant. The screen in front of the courtyard ranged with the south side of Pall Mall; but in the remainder of that famous street there was no sign of the architectural dignity to which it was ultimately to attain as 'Clubland.' In the Crace Collection is a pencil elevation drawing, by Coney, of both sides of the street, dated 1796, and which probably represents its general appearance till a good many years later. The only building in it of a superior class was Schomberg House, about the middle of the south side, a heavy but rather dignified brick front, built at the close of the seventeenth century, with projecting wings at each end, and a columned porch at the centre projecting over the pavement. At this period it had been divided into three houses, without, however, interfering with the architectural unity of the front. It stood thus till the middle of the century, when one wing was pulled down, and the remainder, as it may now be seen, annexed as part of the War Office. On the north side of Pall Mall, on the site of the present Marlborough Gallery, was the narrow classic front of the Shakespeare Gallery, with an arched doorway flanked by columns, and a basrelief figure of Shakespeare, and two allegorical females grouped with him. This also remained till past the middle of the century. The rest of Pall Mall consisted only of street houses of very ordinary type. Marlborough House indeed existed, a long low house standing back from the street, and with its courtyard gateway apparently where the present one is, built by Wren, but not showing much sign of such distinguished architectural parentage. The northern portions of St. James's Square were then much the same as now. In King Street stood the warehouselike exterior of Almack's, till lately Willis's Rooms, designed by the eminent

Scotch architect, Robert Mylne—strange-looking outer shell for the central entertaining rooms of the London fashionable world for so many years, and a curious illustration of the indifference to external architecture in the eighteenth century, so long as interior comfort and elegance were secured.

The Haymarket still retained some of the old rural-looking houses which went so well with the name, and the theatre was not much at variance with their simplicity, presenting a low but deep one-story portico or verandah, supported by columns, at the back of which were plain square barnlike doors, and above the portico one story of brick wall with the windows of an ordinary street house. On the western side, however, the exterior walls of Her Majesty's Opera House existed as now; but the colonnade was not added till 1820, about the same time that the present façade of the theatre opposite was added by Nash. Trafalgar Square came into first existence in 1829, though not then presenting anything like its present appearance. Going eastward to the Strand, it is curious to find this street, in the early part of the century, a good deal more advanced in its average street architecture than Piccadilly or Pall Mall, at least at the end nearest Charing Cross, the houses being more modern and more solidly built. Probably the presence of old Northumberland House exercised some influence on the adjacent property. Here and there we come on characteristic buildings. Old Hungerford Market, in a view of 1805, is shown, indeed, as a wretched hole, looking like a farmyard, with an old barn in the middle.* On the other hand, Adam's Adelphi plot had been built long before, and the Adelphi, then the 'Sanspareil,' Theatre, showed in 1806 a sufficiently dignified entrance front, with a Doric order and an Attic story over; while the Olympic, on the other hand, for some time later, was even more naïve in its architecture than the old Haymarket, having a verandah supported by plain posts, the upper story a kind of mansard roof, slated and falling back very slightly from the perpendicular, with upright windows standing out a little from the slating. The Lyceum Theatre front of the day was a narrow house with a ground-floor portico of Doric columns, and three stories of

* This was about the site of the present Charing Cross Railway Station. There is a coloured print, dated 1832, commemorating the fêtes at the opening of the new Hungerford Market, removed in 1860 to make way for the station.

plain windows above it. On the north side of the Strand, where Burleigh Street now is, was old Exeter Change, a long brick elevation, with a cemented architecturalised centre piece, with Corinthian columns, and 'Pidcock's Menagerie' inscribed on it; the ground floor was occupied with the square shop windows, divided into a number of small panes, which were characteristic of the period.* The Strand roadway, narrow as some parts of it still are, was a good deal narrower then, and when we come to the east end we find it runs straight on in a line past Essex Street, leaving a narrow gut where the south-east corner of St. Clement Danes' Church cuts in. A drawing in 1810 shows the houses about to be pulled down for the purpose of making the present southern sweep round St. Clement's; they were much older and more dilapidated than those at the western end of the Strand. Gibbs's church of St. Mary-le-Strand, which some Philistine fanatics have wanted to remove, was, of course, then as now the central ornament of the Strand.

Passing St. Clement Danes, we find the present site of the Law Courts occupied by shops of much the same order as those still existing close by in Holywell Street; one untidy and frowsy-looking fish shop is shown in several views of Temple Bar. There are few sites in London that have undergone such a transformation as this, where it is difficult now even to conjure up in the imagination its aspect as it was but twenty or thirty years back. East and west of Temple Bar were, at the beginning of the century, piles of rickety-looking houses, largely built of wood, with small windows with diamond panes. Among them was the old house bearing the inscription 'The Waxwork,' a low building

* Among the sketches by Capon and others, and the earlier sketches by Shepherd, illustrating the street architecture of London as it existed in the earlier part of the present century, two types of shop front are found; the more common being the large square form of window just mentioned (which is generally filled up with plain boarding below the window sill); the other and more picturesque form being that of a projecting bay window, forming a segment of a circle on plan, on each side of the shop door. Of the former type, a good example is to be seen in the front of an old-established tobacco warehouse on the south side of Great Queen Street, Drury Lane, evidently preserved or restored with religious care; and of the bay-window type there is an example in a well-known cigar shop near the top of the Haymarket, on the east side. It is difficult to say which is the older of these types, they occur together in so many drawings of varying dates. In picturesqueness and good taste the best of them form a marked contrast to the flaring plate-glass fronts of the present day.

looking a little more solid than some of the rest, the 'Tussaud's' of the day, with odd hieroglyphic figures on the walls and a fish over the door. A noteworthy house in a very different sense was Hoare's old bank, a narrow prim little house with a pedimented doorway and a square window of many panes on each side of it, after the manner of the shop windows, but somewhat more substantial. Old St. Dunstan, 'St. Dunstan-in-the-West,' stood at a corner where the street suddenly widened, and presented an odd mixture of Late Gothic with classic features; over its porch was a classic tribune or joss-house in which two figures struck the bells at the quarters, and from its walls projected the clock at the end of a bracket which held it out almost into the middle of the street. This was overdone, but it is a far more sensible way of placing a clock face in a street than by planting it flat on a wall where no one can read it except when nearly opposite to it, and Street was right in following the ancient habit in placing the clock on the Law Courts Tower, perhaps the only merit which the tower can be said to have. The present St. Dunstan's tower, a piece of sham Gothic of the early revival, displaced the old church and its ringing figures in 1831.

We will not take the reader further east than St. Paul's—'the City' is a separate history in itself—but wind round the east end of the church, noticing gloomy old St. Paul's School, where there now stands a crescent of shops and offices, the work of two architects who seem to have made a mutual arrangement to deface the precincts of the cathedral by the most commonplace thing they could put down there. Round the turn we should have found, where Sir R. Smirke's ugly and uninteresting General Post Office building now is, the collection of shops and houses shown in Schnebbelie's drawing of 1818, 'Houses to be taken down for the new 'Post Office.' Turning back towards Holborn we pass Newgate in its present guise (soon, probably, to disappear), and St. Sepulchre's Church, not yet 'restored' into its Gothic dress, and the old front of Furnival's Inn, by Inigo Jones, a plain basement story, with small windows and a low circular-headed entrance door in the centre, and a Corinthian order of pilasters over it; the building looks dilapidated and weather-stained in contemporary drawings, but had far more architectural character than the present front. Inigo Jones's front succeeded to a mediæval one, and in sketches of the early part of this century there are still to be seen strange tumbledown bits of half-timber building as portions of

Furnival's Inn. Then we descend into Holborn valley, picturesque but inconvenient, with its steep gradient and slippery and dirty old-fashioned wood pavement in large porous blocks. As to the regions just north of Holborn, now occupied partly by the new markets, it is difficult to find our way in the old maps and sketches, so thoroughly have old landmarks been obliterated in the march of improvement; but we come upon one characteristic testimony to the former state of things in the neighbourhood of Smithfield, in Shepherd's drawing (as late as 1844) of Fleet ditch as it appeared in West Street, Smithfield, a muddy torrent running close past the back walls of some miserable houses, and crossed from bank to bank with poles to prevent the banks from falling in.

Coming to the Bloomsbury neighbourhood, we find three sides of the square as they are now, except for the absence of Mr. Collcutt's picturesque house on the east side, and of one or two new and (alas!) not at all picturesque fronts near the north-west angle, but the north side was occupied up to 1800 by Bedford House, standing back from the roadway behind its garden. The centre garden of the square is bare and treeless, a mere railed space. The north side of Great Russell Street was occupied, where the British Museum railing now stands, by the lofty solid screen wall of Montague House, ornamented with panelling and urns on the coping, and a massive centre gateway with a Doric order and a small cupola over it. Behind this stood Montague House, a château-like erection with wings and a receding centre, and high mansard roofs rising into pavilions at the wings. Montague House was adopted for the British Museum in the middle of the eighteenth century, but the present front block and façade, by Sydney Smirke, were not built till 1847, the old house being shortly before that pulled down. Queen Square, like Brunswick Square, was 'very airy' in those days, and a more or less fashionable place of residence; a view of it looking north, in 1812, shows the northern side looking out into open country and a line of hills in the distance. Red Lion Square, now a mere 'back' neighbourhood, then stood on the same social and architectural footing as Queen Square; architecturally it has of late years been once more brought into prominence by becoming the site of one of the finest and most original of modern London edifices, Mr. Pearson's church of St. John the Evangelist, on the west side of the square.

While the north side of Holborn was thus a somewhat

aristocratic region of mansions and superior squares, overlooked by the steeple of St. George's, Bloomsbury (built from the designs of Hawksmoor about 1730),* the south side of the same portion was full of ugly corners, many of them still awaiting their purgation. Lincoln's Inn Fields was even in the early part of the century beginning to fall from its high estate, and the once princely mansions (as they were then considered) on the west side of the square, whose courtyards and massive brick gate piers still attest their former dignity, were beginning to be deserted as high-class residences. But the squalor and dilapidation of many corners of the neighbourhood about here and Drury Lane, as shown in sketches of the early part of the century and as late as 1850, can hardly be credited. Even as it now stands, it is a kind of neighbourhood where one would gladly see the purification of a second Fire of London applied, as the only effectual means of cleansing a spot over which the fœtid odour of generations of dirt and decay seems to hang. The County Council have taken the first step towards improving this region of London by opening one considerable area, and offering premiums for the best plans for a large model lodging house to be shortly erected thereon. It is to be hoped this is only the beginning of a thorough clearing out of a portion of London the condition of which, considering its close proximity to two leading thoroughfares, and to the two largest and most frequented theatres, is a standing disgrace.

The leading western squares, north of the Piccadilly line, were mostly in existence before the present century; and in the old engravings such squares as Grosvenor, Hanover, Manchester, and Portman Squares present a strong family likeness, showing for the most part ranges of houses of very plain and unpretending appearance, and footwalks nearly level with the road pavement and protected from the invasion of vehicles by rows of posts along the curb line. A drawing of Grosvenor Square in 1754 shows the central garden laid out, Dutch fashion, in symmetrical parterres. Generally the square gardens showed no trees,

* Few persons probably are aware that the peculiar spire (if so it can be called) of this church was intended as a restoration of the design of the great monument of Mausolus according to the description of Pausanias. The discovery by Sir Charles Newton of the actual remains, though leaving us far short of an assured restoration, has, at any rate, left that of Hawksmoor entirely impossible.

but were merely railed-in lawns. On the north side of Manchester Square stood Manchester House, a plain stone front with pilasters of a Corinthian order, now replaced by, or altered into, the present more ample dimensions of Hertford House. Portman Square existed as at present. On the north of Oxford Street was Stratford Place, designed by Adam, with the Earl of Aldborough's mansion at the northern extremity, and the houses forming return wings up to the street as at present; but a well-designed iron grille then shut out the 'Place' from Oxford Street, the remainder of which, looking westwards, consisted of poor and mean-looking houses. At the bottom of Portland Place stood, within its walled garden (the present site of the Langham Hotel), Foley House, a plain brick eighteenth century erection, which influenced the unusual width of Portland Place, because (as Mr. Wheatley tells us) of a covenant in Lord Foley's lease, that no houses were to be built to the north of his residence. The house is shown in a drawing of Shepherd's as late as 1844. All Souls' Church did not appear till 1822, the design of Nash, of whom there exists a caricature (dated 1824) showing the architect, in blue coat and yellow breeches, spitted on the top of his own spire, with some satirical verses beneath. The church, however, hardly merits all this ridicule; it was an original and not altogether bad attempt to combine the effect of the Gothic spire with the general details of classic architecture; and it is, at all events, more architectural and more original than Inwood's attempt, a few years previously, to apply Grecian architecture to a modern steeple—that of St. Pancras—by piling three Greek temples one upon another.

Along the Marylebone Road we find on the left the old church, a barnlike erection with a door at the end and two rows of low round-headed windows along the sides, to be replaced, in 1817, by the present rather fine classical parish church, designed by Hardwicke. Paddington Church stood in the country among trees and lanes, a prim little quasi-classic structure with a pilastered porch and a small cupola. Capon's beautiful little watercolour drawing of 1785, looking westward from the end of Seymour Street, shows the Edgware Road as a mere country road, with a wide distance of meadows beyond. In a drawing dated 1828 we have the junction of Regent's Canal at Paddington—a small lake with wooded islets. Under date 1805 we have a drawing giving a view of Westbourne Place, Paddington—a large house in its own park, with a pediment and oriel windows.

A view of 'Camden Town from Wellin's Farm,' in 1799, shows us the picturesque farm in the foreground, somewhere about the middle of Regent's Park, and, looking eastward, a row of plain white houses (Camden Town) running north and south in the middle distance of the view. Such was then the scenery to the north and east of the boundary lines of Marylebone and Edgware Roads.

Coming to the southern portion of London, we find Buckingham Palace at the beginning of the century consisting of a comparatively small square central house, with two lower wings projecting in front at each side, and connected with the main block by two low buildings with colonnades, each forming a quadrant of a circle. This was Buckingham House, built in the early part of the eighteenth century. In front of it, and partially flanked at each side by the wing buildings was a courtyard, with a fountain decorated with tritons in the centre. The avenue of the Mall was then on the axis of the centre of the house, and nearly parallel with it on the south side ran the old canal-like lake of St. James's Park, the whole thing being completely in Dutch taste. The house was altered by Nash early in the century. A view of it dated 1827 shows the main building of much the same proportions as before—in fact, it seems probable that some part of old Buckingham House was retained in the palace, but there is a dome over it, and in the centre of the east side of the courtyard is seen the Marble Arch, then and there first erected by Nash. A drawing of 1837 shows the palace as altered by Blore, the dome removed, and an elaborate suggestion for laying out the ground in front of it in ornamental ponds and parterres, which was never carried out. At this time, however, it had really more of architectural style than is shown by the present front, also designed by Blore some twelve or thirteen years later, one of the poorest and most commonplace elevations of an important royal palace that perhaps was ever designed. At the same time the Marble Arch was removed and rebuilt in its present position.

The history of Whitehall and Parliament Street, and the Houses of Parliament, in the early part of the century, is very completely given in contemporary drawings. A bird's-eye view by J. T. Smith, taken from the top of the Banqueting House in 1807, gives a tolerably complete idea of the Whitehall of that day. The Admiralty buildings were there as now, and Melbourne House (now called Dover House), with its low but graceful classic front designed by Holland, and the cupola over it; and the Horse Guards building

is unaltered. Except these buildings, the upper portion of Whitehall was occupied by commonplace street houses. Between the Horse Guards and the Admiralty screen was the Half-pay Office, a plain front with a low wide gable and a circular window in it. On the site of the present north wing of the Privy Council offices (often incorrectly called the Treasury buildings) stood the only building which could take us back into the times of mediæval England—a portion of Wolsey's old palace called York Place, and referred to in the well-known lines in 'Henry VIII.':—

> ——'you
> Must no more call it York Place, that is past;
> For since the cardinal fell, that title's lost;
> 'Tis now the king's, and called Whitehall.'

This was then the Treasury, as it existed till near the middle of the present century. It was a square piece of dilapidated old Late Gothic building, with an evidently very thick wall on the ground story, above which the wall face was set back, but strengthened by buttresses rising to the top of the building, between which were square windows with architraves, of the Renaissance type, which had replaced the original late Gothic traceried windows of Wolsey's time. At the angles were small turrets. There seems to have been a reluctance to remove this historic old fragment, for when Sir John Soane's buildings were erected on the site of the present Privy Council buildings, the façade, which was obviously planned to have a centre and two wings symmetrically arranged, was left incomplete, the centre and the southern wing only being built, the old remnant of the palace still occupying the place where should have been the northern wing, and the new incomplete façade abutting upon it in a very awkward manner. It was only when Barry erected the front of the present buildings in 1847 that the ancient fragment was removed, and the new front built with both wings complete; Barry (like every architect of genius and power) having not very much consideration for old buildings that stood in the way of the adequate completion of a new one. In regard to the relation between the present façade and that of Soane, Mr. Wheatley rather misses a point in merely describing it as a new façade 'replacing that of Soane;' the fact is that Barry remodelled Soane's design, retaining the same columnar order, but raising it on a complete ground story, and adding an Attic over; in Soane's design the order rose from a plinth

only a little above the ground level. Fergusson, in his 'History of Modern Architecture,' expresses the opinion that Barry would have produced a finer façade had he not been fettered by the instruction to work up Soane's materials.

Another relic of mediæval architecture, in the shape of a vaulted Gothic archway which formed the entrance to Scotland Yard, existed in Whitehall up to very near the close of the eighteenth century; the precise time of its disappearance it is not easy to fix, but as late as 1824, when the entrance is shown as crossed by a classic architrave upheld by two columns, the interior buildings of the 'yard' presented a most mediæval appearance; a view of the exterior of 'The Guardroom, Scotland Yard,' showing a small cottage-like building, with gablets and mullioned windows with diamond panes, and a broad flight of wooden steps up to the door. South of the Council Office on the west side of Whitehall was old Downing Street, with its plain brick houses and somewhat elegant classic doorways, and south of this Fludyer Street, with similar brick houses, running, with a bend in it, from Whitehall to the Park. This remained till 1859, when the space was cleared for the new Government offices.

We come now to the historic centre of the seat of legislation, of which numerous drawings exist; and it requires all their assistance for the imagination to realise what an extraordinary change the century has made in this important site. At the commencement of the century the north end of Westminster Hall was in a dilapidated state, with its principal Gothic features entirely extinguished; at either side of the north door were mean-looking shops and booths, and a row of tall posts opposite the door. Westward from the north end of the Hall was the old Exchequer Court, relieved at the end by an octagon turret, beyond which the line of old buildings continued, bending a little northward. In 1820 these were taken down, and subsequently rebuilt, as far as the octagon turret, in somewhat the same style, but with a battlemented finish; and in 1822 the north end of the Hall was restored by Cottingham to something more approaching Gothic architecture, though in a hard and mechanical manner, as was inevitable at that period. Proceeding southward down St. Margaret Street we should have had on our left Kent's dull classic front to the Committee Rooms, subsequently utilised as the front to the Courts of Justice, arranged by Soane between it and the west side of Westminster Hall. This classic front returned round at the

south end towards the entrance to St. Stephen's Chapel (the then House of Commons), and formed part of the north side of Old Palace Yard. It is when we come here that we are fully conscious of the immensity of the change that has been wrought. The purlieus of the House of Lords were of an almost squalid description. The entrance to the House of Lords was by an old-fashioned little gabled porch on small columns, and with a couple of obelisk-shaped lamp posts before the door; north of this entrance was a plain square pedimented house, and near it was the 'old sutlers' house,' the 'Ship,' shown in a drawing of Shepherd's of the early part of the century. In drawings of the date of 1820 and 1821, however, we find the House of Lords faced, towards Old Palace Yard, with a Strawberry Hill Gothic façade with turrets and battlements, and in front of it is a low quasi-Gothic screen of the same fashion, with an arched gateway inserted in it.* The House of Lords proper, after this period at all events, flanked the east side of Old Palace Yard, and the interior access to it must have been of a somewhat roundabout description; but at the commencement of the century the Painted Chamber, at right angles with it, is described in old prints as the House of Lords. At least, there is more than one 'view of the House of 'Lords from the river' in the first five years of the century which shows nothing but the end of the Painted Chamber, with two dilapidated Gothic windows, and sheds built up against the walls. The history of this part of the site seems not to have been adequately traced by Mr. Wheatley; at least, there is no intelligible account of it—one of the few serious defects we have found in the book.

Westward of Palace Yard and the Abbey was a congeries of winding streets, picturesquely piled and tumbledown houses, with here and there a respectable staid-looking block of brick almshouses or a scholastic establishment, and beyond these it was not far before we arrived at open country. J. T. Smith's view of Dean's Yard in 1820 shows a scene of squalor and dilapidation such as it is difficult to realise in looking at the present neat and orderly square. Tottle Street (so spelt), in a drawing of the same period, is a very narrow winding street with overhanging houses; and a drawing of 1808 shows 'Little Sanctuary,' with a street architecture reminding one of the older portions of Chester.

* The façade was the work of Wyatt; the screen added afterwards, probably by Soane.

Amid this congeries of decaying streets stood some of the pleasant brick Queen Anne buildings which are still spared, such as Emmanuel Hospital, Greycoat Hospital (commemorated in two charming drawings of Shepherd's), and other more humble institutions which no longer exist. A drawing of 1796 shows a melancholy-looking group of irregular cottages standing apart, with a pond in front of them, under the title, 'The Pesthouses in Tothill Fields.' Further westward we come on more cheerful scenes in the picturesque neighbourhood of Pimlico, the beauties of which are exhibited in a pretty water-colour drawing of 1815, giving a view of 'Jenny Whim's Bridge' and the adjacent landscape. Mr. Wheatley describes 'Jenny's Whim' as 'a tavern and tea garden at the end of the wooden bridge 'known as Ebury Bridge, over what was formerly a cut or 'reservoir of the Chelsea Waterworks, between Chelsea and 'Pimlico. The last vestige of it was obliterated in 1865, 'when the great widening of the Victoria Station took 'place.' The view, looking north-east from below the bridge, shows a park-like landscape, with water and green lawns and foliage, and an island covered with trees and further decorated by two windmills showing among them.

The general state of the district between this and Westminster, as just described, seems to have received its first serious change about 1851, when we meet with a drawing illustrating the 'pulling down of houses to form the new 'Victoria Street.' But in coming to our notes on the new architectural era of London, we cannot commence better than by retracing our steps to Westminster and considering the architecture of the most important and celebrated building of modern London. It was on the night of October 16, 1834, that Charles Barry, already known to many as an architect of exceptional ability, but who had not then achieved any very extended fame, was returning from a professional visit in the country, when he saw the glare in the sky indicative of a great fire. He hurried to the place, and remained the whole night watching the burning of the Houses of Parliament, perhaps not without dreams of what he might produce to replace them. An official rebuilding was at first all that was thought of, and Sir Robert Smirke had even been desired to make plans for this; but the strong public feeling that this was a great opportunity prevailed, and eventually, in June 1835, a committee of the House of Lords settled the terms of a competition, allowing only six

months for maturing the designs, and ruling that the style of the proposed building was to be 'Gothic or Elizabethan.' No fewer than ninety-seven designs were sent in, and for all those who went into it with a serious intent to be winners the labour and mental strain in producing an adequate plan and design within the time allotted must have been enormous, as in Barry's case we know that it was. After some delay his design, which had attracted much notice from competent judges from the first, was definitely adopted. As every one knows, Barry had selected the style of Late Gothic prevalent in the reign of Henry VII. in preference to the mixed style connected with the name of Elizabeth, in which the last relics of Gothic are blended with the rising spirit of Renaissance detail; and as one or other style was forced upon him, there is no doubt he did wisely in selecting, for such a building, that which was still a complete style, coherent in all its details. However well the picturesque quality of Elizabethan architecture may be adapted to a private mansion, it wants the elements of breadth and consistency requisite for the dignity of a great public edifice. But it is equally certain that the Government, nearly always unfortunate in its official interferences with architecture, made a fatal mistake in limiting the competitors at all as to style, a mistake both in regard to general principle and to the special genius of the architect whom they selected. Barry's peculiar power and predilection lay in the direction of the Renaissance form of architecture, in which there was an opportunity of carrying out, without absolute copyism, that modern combination of classical elements which characterised the Italian Renaissance, and has therefore received the name of the Renaissance style, but which in reality leaves the architect free (as Barry himself has practically shown in other buildings) to produce entirely new combinations in the same spirit and without servile imitation. Had Barry been left free to do as he liked in regard to the architectural treatment of the Houses of Parliament, there cannot be a doubt that he would have based his design on the Renaissance style, and that, working in accordance with his own special gifts and architectural sympathies, he would have produced a much finer building, and one more in keeping with the spirit and with the practical requirements of the present day.

Even as it stands, however, London may well be proud both of the building and of its architect, who was a Londoner, and born in Westminster (in 1795) on a spot close to the

site on which he was afterwards to rear the structure with which his name will always be connected. Barry was one of those men who may be said to have been a born architect, gifted with that peculiar faculty for perceiving what can be made of a site and of a plan, both in a practical and artistic sense, which is something quite distinct from the mere production of pictorial architecture. He was the only architect who has risen to fame in modern England who combined in an equal degree practical knowledge and ability with artistic perception. He was a master of planning; he disdained no practical details, and he had that delicate perception of proportion and refinement in design which enabled him to leave the stamp of architectural grace and dignity upon everything he touched. In regard to the Houses of Parliament, the character of the detail was fixed for him, more or less, by the style adopted; and had he chosen his own style, we should, no doubt, have had a building less florid in detail, and with more of the effect obtainable from the contrast of decorated with undecorated wall surface. As it is, no doubt, the building is over-rich in detail; not more so, indeed less so, than in the adjoining Henry VII.'s Chapel, a genuine and typical Tudor building; but a treatment which is agreeable enough in a decorative chapel becomes excessive when carried all over the surface of a vast palace. Apart from this, there is little but praise to be given to the building. Its low position is unfortunate, but for that also the architect was probably not entirely responsible. But in other respects the building is worthy of its function.

It is characteristic of Barry that the finest architectural thought in it should be expressed in the plan—in the idea of the four main corridors, at right angles to one another, and meeting in the central octagon, the position of which is externally expressed by the graceful central lantern. It was another fine architectural thought to place the two towers at the extreme ends of the structure, the extent of which is thus marked out, from a distance, when the rest of the building cannot be seen; nor was Barry less happy in his characteristic treatment of the two towers; the one purely a state ceremonial tower, marking the royal entrance, and therefore treated as a piece of architectural effect merely; the other a utilitarian tower, intended to carry a great clock, and designed so as to express that function. This distinction, which would seem so obvious, and is so truly architectural in spirit, seems, however, to be beyond the comprehension of some people, and it is difficult to read

with patience the flippant sneers of Mr. Loftie, who appears to combine a superstitious reverence for any and every old building with an inability to admire anything modern, and who cannot see that the fact of the clock tower looking like nothing but a clock tower is precisely its merit. If Barry had made the two towers similar and balancing each other symmetrically, he would have taken away half the character of the whole group of building.

The removal of Soane's Law Courts from the west side of Westminster Hall a few years ago exposed to view an unsightly and much patched-up wall, and the flying buttresses in a very dilapidated state, together with a certain portion of the original Norman masonry of the Hall, about which a somewhat disproportionate excitement was got up, in accordance with the modern feeling, which is too much disposed to make a fetish of any bit of ancient work, however plain and uninteresting in itself. It was impossible to leave the building in the state in which it was found when uncovered, and the discovery of some traces of the former existence of a double-storied cloister between the buttresses furnished an excuse for a so-called 'restoration' of this feature; the first motive of which, from Mr. Pearson's report to the First Commissioner of Works, evidently was to find a means of covering in and preserving the fragment of Norman wall. As this was obviously a most abnormal outlay for such an object, it was claimed in favour of the scheme that rooms could be formed between the buttresses which would be of use as committee rooms; thus inverting the true order of architectural procedure, which is to provide for ascertained requirements on a definite plan, not to erect an apparently useless structure and then find a use for it afterwards. The subject was discussed at great length by a special commission composed of men who had mostly no knowledge of architecture, the one or two who did know anything of the subject being entirely opposed to the scheme, but hopelessly in the minority. The result has answered only too well the expectations of those who understood best what it was which was proposed. The 'restoration' of the cloisters is no restoration at all in the strict sense, as there were really no data for anything beyond a general conclusion that something of the kind was formerly there; and, even if there were, the mere building up again or 'restoring' an ancient piece of architecture because it once existed is an absurdity; a modern imitation is not the ancient thing, and has not the slightest archæo-

logical value. The rooms are found, as might have been expected, to be inconvenient and cramped in themselves and inconvenient of access, and the area of Westminster Hall has been spoiled by the obtrusion of two staircases adorned with gimcrack heraldic animals, the sight of which raised a storm of derision from members of the House of Commons who had sense enough to see the absurdity, when completed, of a scheme which they might have prevented had they troubled themselves to ascertain its merits beforehand, instead of protesting when it was too late. It should be mentioned that Barry's original intention was to have carried out a further extension of the Houses of Parliament in two blocks of building surrounding the space east and north of Westminster Hall, which would have provided committee rooms and other accommodation for all possible future requirements, and he left plans for this addition which are still in existence, and which it may some day be absolutely necessary to carry out. The side of Westminster Hall would then have been blocked out from exterior view, as in all probability (on the evidence of old plans and drawings) it always was; and Barry would have met the difficulty by refacing it in such a manner as to carry on the design of his courtyard. To many sentimental persons in the present day this would seem absolute desecration, but it is what any mediæval architect would have done in a similar case without hesitation. The exaggerated reverence for every bit of old building is entirely a growth of the present generation, and merely means that architecture is a dead and not a living art now.

The next important public building after the Houses of Parliament was the Government offices, the great block extending from Parliament Street to St. James's Park. This and the new Admiralty building, at present in progress, have a relation to each other not generally surmised; they are the *disjecta membra* of what was once a great scheme, worthy of the nation, and which has gone through stages of successive decline. Barry drew out, and exhibited in Westminster Hall in 1857, a really grand plan for the concentration of the whole of the Government offices in one vast building, or group of buildings, to extend from Great George Street nearly to the Horse Guards, and to have fronts towards Whitehall and St. James's Park. The present block of the Privy Council buildings was to be utilised (architecturally speaking) as the northern wing of the

Whitehall façade, and a similar wing to be formed abutting on the east end of Great George Street, the houses east of King Street being abolished, and the wide roadway of Whitehall carried through. Between these two wings the central line of building was to be thrown back somewhat, and through the centre of it was to be a grand gateway or covered way leading into a great colonnaded central hall or court, a parallelogram with its longer axis running east and west, and an opening at the further end into St. James's Park. On the south side of the block would have been a grand façade to Great George Street; on the north side the façade towards the parade ground was to be laid out so as to be at right angles with the line of the Horse Guards, which was to be architecturally connected with the whole scheme, and on the north side of the parade ground a façade (for Admiralty extension) was to be formed facing that on the south of the parade ground, leaving the latter a symmetrical parallelogram with the Horse Guards in the centre of its eastern side, and a central gate into St. James's Park facing it on the western side. The vast new building was to be laid out around various interior quadrangles, around each of which would be grouped the offices of a special department. The Board of Trade would have been accommodated in the block balancing the existing Privy Council buildings, with the 'Trade Office Court' in its rear; the Home Office and Foreign Office would have formed the two sides of the façade overlooking the park, with the 'Home 'Office Court' and 'Foreign Office Court' in their rear; the War Office would have formed the central block of the Park façade, returning along one side of the great central hall; and the same principle was to be carried out through other departments. All the Government offices would thus have been combined into one great architectural whole, in close relation with each other, and in the immediate neighbourhood of the Houses of Parliament. The houses on the southern side of Great George Street were to be pulled down, and the land between that street and the Abbey laid out as an ornamental garden. Thus Great George Street would have formed, along with Birdcage Walk, a kind of state road between the palace of the sovereign and the palace of the Legislature. The scheme included a wide road from the foot of the Haymarket through St. James's Park and past the end of Birdcage Walk to join the east end of Victoria Street; a road which would have been a great public convenience. That, however, was no essential

part of the scheme; the main thing was the arrangement of the buildings, and it is rarely that an architectural project at once so practical and so grandiose has been proposed for any official buildings. It would, no doubt, have cost an immense sum of money, but it might have been carried out gradually and piece by piece, and when complete it would have been a thing for the nation to be proud of. It is melancholy now to look at the plan, and to reflect upon a great opportunity lost.

The whole business of the Government offices has been a kind of *decrescendo* from the great idea thus propounded by Barry. The Government did at one time so far entertain the idea of the Great George Street site for Government offices that they purchased some property in the street as a commencement—just enough to be of no practical use unless the scheme were carried further, as it is needless to say it never has been. In 1856, however, the Government made up their minds to combine the Foreign, Home, and Colonial Offices, the India Office, and the Local Government offices on the central portion of the site originally proposed by Barry; and a competition took place for this, in which the designs of Scott were ultimately selected. Here again, however, we had an instance of the same ill-judged State interference in regard to style as in the case of the Houses of Parliament. No style was in the first instance imposed on the competitors, as in that case; but Scott having sent in a design in a somewhat Italian variety of Gothic, Lord Palmerston, who chose to constitute himself arbiter of taste for the nation (a self-assumed position for which he had about as little qualification as could be), obstinately refused to have anything to say to a Gothic design, and left the architect with the alternative of abandoning his most cherished convictions or relinquishing his commission. Some of Scott's best friends thought, not unreasonably, that he would have taken a higher position if he had stood to his colours and refused to sacrifice the artistic convictions which he had professed during his whole lifetime, especially as he had already made an almost unexampled success in his professional career. Whether, however, he would really have produced a building very superior to the existing one if he had been allowed to carry out his Gothic design, may be questioned. His real power consisted in his mastery of ecclesiastical Gothic, and he did not possess, beyond this particular line of work, by which he made most of his reputation, a very high architectural faculty; he was seldom thoroughly successful when

he quitted his peculiar walk, and his great façade to the St. Pancras Station shows that, even when left with a free hand as regards style, he did not succeed in producing a secular or business building which could command permanent admiration. At the time the St. Pancras Station was built it was thought so spirited and so splendid an innovation to build a Gothic railway station that great enthusiasm was excited in regard to the work; but now that the Gothic fever has died out it does not find many admirers, and it would very possibly have been the same with the Government offices had they been carried out according to the original Gothic design. There would probably, however, have been better detail than we find in the building as it now exists, in which the architect was working with materials with which he had no sympathy. Taken all round, the Government offices can be called no more than a respectable building: it has no originality, no breadth of treatment, and excites no interest. The best portion of it is the internal façade of the courtyard. The front towards Whitehall, it must in justice be remembered, is not carried out altogether as designed, as the angle pavilions were intended to have been carried up higher with some kind of cupola or other finish, which was cut off, from the spirit of economy which so often leads to the spoiling of our public buildings; and there is no doubt that with this accentuation of the angles the general effect of the front would be very much improved, though it could not atone for the generally commonplace character of the details. We may note one fact in connexion with it which Mr. Wheatley does not mention—viz. that in regard to the westward portion of the buildings Scott was by official direction associated with Sir Digby Wyatt as joint architect, but we have no data for apportioning the precise part which each took in the work.

The new Law Courts was the next great official work. After two or three alterations of programme, twelve architects were, in 1866, invited to compete—Messrs. Abraham, E. M. Barry (the son of Sir Charles Barry), R. Brandon, Burges, T. N. Deane, Garling, Gibson, Lockwood, Seddon, Scott, Street, and Waterhouse. The first in the list, an architect little known to fame, owed his invitation to some official influence. The others were selected for their reputation. The designs, which were sent in and exhibited in 1867, excited great interest, and unquestionably, in their variety and picturesque character, spoke highly for the architectural genius of England, though an eminent judge

is said to have remarked, on visiting the exhibition, 'I see 'a great many fine towers; but where are the courts?' Among them Burges's design was remarkable for its powerful treatment of a French type of Gothic; Mr. Garling's for great breadth and dignity; Scott's design displayed the same characteristics in a very different form; Barry's showed a novelty in a dome with classic outline but Gothic detail; Mr. Seddon's was remarkable for a wild picturesqueness, and for a colossal Record Tower, which was by no means so abnormal a conception as the public seem to have thought; Street's design also was characterised by picturesqueness and variety, with admirable treatment of Gothic detail. Gothic was all in power now, and few thought of protesting against it. Eventually the jury, among whom there was not a single artist or architect (again according to the usual absurdity of English practice in such matters),* ruled that E. M. Barry's was the best plan (a verdict which was hardly questioned), and that Street's was the best design, and that, accordingly, Barry and Street should be appointed joint architects. As it had been before settled that plan was to count before design, there can be no doubt that E. M. Barry practically won the competition, and had a right to the appointment; and everyone who knew Street's character, his force of individual will, and his intolerance of any style of architecture except revived thirteenth century Gothic, must have known that such a combination was practically impossible; and, indeed, the very idea of appointing one architect for the plan, and the other for the design, of a building, was preposterous in itself. Street soon succeeded in pushing Barry out, and the latter was promised a great new design for the National Gallery, of which he was afterwards deprived, and put off with the task of merely carrying out the new rooms at the back of the Gallery—a double disappointment which, there is no doubt, shortened his life. It cannot be pretended that E. M. Barry inherited the genius of his father; practical knowledge and ability in planning were his strong points, and his Law Courts design evinced these qualities rather than

* The jury consisted of Mr. W. Cowper, then First Commissioner of Works (and one of the best we ever had); Mr. Gladstone; Sir A. Cockburn, the Lord Chief Justice; Sir Roundell Palmer, then Attorney-General; and Mr. W. Stirling, M.P. In France, in a similar case, the jury would almost certainly have included an equal number of men distinguished in art and architecture.

architectural genius; but it would probably have been very much better for public convenience if he had received the commission which, according to the terms of the competition, he had justly earned.

Street's front to the Strand was designed on the principle (quite justifiable in itself) that it was of no use to attempt a grand façade of one homogeneous design on a site facing a comparatively narrow roadway, where it could never be properly seen as a whole; and it was, therefore, purposely broken up into a varied architectural scenery with no predominating design. Some talk was made of placing the building on the Thames Embankment, for which position Street made a design; but though this would have been a grand site architecturally, the present more central one is probably much more convenient for business. Of the building generally, it is a difficult and rather a melancholy task to speak. It is at all events not commonplace, and the whole of the detail shows the hand of a master of Gothic architecture,* more especially in the mouldings, which have the fullness and largeness of style characteristic of the mediæval spirit; and every detail in the building was designed by his own hand. The design for the great hall was the object of a very uncalled-for attack by Fergusson, who, with all his breadth of insight into the conditions of architecture generally, was often singularly captious, unfair, and irritable in his criticisms on special buildings, and who wrote letters in the 'Times' against Street's hall on the mere ground that a narrow vaulted hall, like the nave of a cathedral, had never been used for such a purpose, and that it ought to have been a wide timber-roofed space like Westminster Hall. There seems no possible reason why what had never been done before should not be done now, and the *salle des pas perdus* of the Law Courts is a fine hall, and none the worse for being vaulted. But the building generally is sadly deficient, externally, in architectural dignity and refinement. The tower, if it can be called a tower, is probably the very ugliest erection of its kind that has ever been attached to an important building. The charge of inconvenience and bad acoustic properties, made against the courts themselves, has been a good deal exaggerated, espe-

* Street was a pupil of Scott's, and it was Scott's own testimony that he had on one occasion mistaken for ancient mediæval work a portion of a building erected some years previously by Street, and which had been more than usually weatherworn.

cially by learned judges, who are, as a class, peculiarly hard to satisfy in these matters. But as to the general plan, with its rabbit-warren arrangement, its narrow and inconvenient staircases and tortuous passages, its dark corners and corridors where the light of day never penetrates, it is to be feared the building deserves all the unkind things that have been said about it. It is the work of an architect who had no genius for plan, and no breadth of architectural conception. Street's talent lay in giving beauty and dignity to parish churches, in which he has been surpassed by no architect of his generation. A multitudinous building like the Law Courts was beyond his powers, and he has left a legacy of inconvenience to generations of lawyers and clients, and all who are obliged to haunt what in this case are too truly 'the dusky purlieus of the law,' encased in a building which may be said to be, architecturally, the grave of modern Gothic.

The next attempt at a great Government building was an entire fiasco. In 1882 was published the new scheme of the Government for a site for the War and Admiralty offices. Architecturally it was one of the worst-devised plans that could be. The buildings were to be placed on a site fronting Whitehall, north of the Horse Guards, and extending in a large square block into the parade ground; but the northern portion of the building was to recede and be half hidden behind the street houses, to save the expenditure of buying up two comparatively new banking houses, one of them (Drummond's bank) one of the very poorest buildings that was ever allowed to waste a fine site. The competition for this proposed building took place in 1884, but it was a sad descent from the Law Courts competition. In that at least architects of genius took part and produced a series of remarkable designs. The Admiralty and War offices competition was a double one, a sketch competition open to all comers first, from which six were to be selected to compete again. But the terms of the competition were so drawn up that few architects of the first rank troubled themselves with the matter. A design was eventually selected which had serious defects in plan, and of which the design seems to have been recommended chiefly by minuteness and finish of draughtsmanship. But even this was not to be carried out. The cry of 'economy' was raised, and the whole was reduced to a patching up of the existing Admiralty building (a poor affair of Ripley's, the architect immortalised by Pope's cutting and certainly in this instance just satire),

and the erection of an additional block of uninteresting building, now in progress, in the most economical manner. This is what we have descended to from Barry's grand plan of 1857. Something more than the loss of a great building is to be deplored; it is the loss of the spirit of artistic ambition in the nation. Public architecture is only an ornament of public life, but it is an ornament which speaks of much behind it. Every noble-minded society, in a state of prosperity, has desired to express its joy and its aspirations in noble buildings; and when there is no longer any care for producing noble architecture—when legislators, elected by popular voice, find that they will best recommend themselves to their constituents by raising the cry of 'economy' whenever there is a question of spending money on producing something beautiful, the nation is infallibly going down hill. 'In the 'youth of a state,' says Bacon in his pregnant sentence, 'arms do flourish; in the middle age of a state, learning; 'and then both of them together for a time; in the declining 'age of a state, mechanical arts and merchandise.' The little kingdom of Belgium has recently spent an enormous sum in the production of a sumptuous Law Courts building, which is the admiration of Europe. England has neither done nor cared to do any such thing since the erection of the Houses of Parliament.

Let us turn westward to the neighbourhood of South Kensington. The impetus given to building in that quarter was started by the establishment of the 1851 Exhibition, on the site in Hyde Park immediately north of that district on which are now grouped the Albert Hall, the Imperial Institute, the Natural History Museum, the City and Guilds of London Institute, and the South Kensington Museum. The commencement was made with the twin iron structure designed (if design it could be called) by Sir William Cubitt, and long known as 'the Brompton 'boilers,' to receive the objects purchased by order of the Board of Trade out of the 1851 Exhibition, and destined to become the nucleus of a collection of worldwide celebrity. The 'boilers' were removed in 1868 to form the shelter of the Bethnal Green Museum, when the structure designed by Captain Fowke, of the Royal Engineers, had been so far advanced as to take their place. The buildings have remained so long unfinished, with their dull brick walls facing the principal entry, that the real merit of Fowke's design, which was considerable, has never been appreciated by the

public, and we observe that Mr. Wheatley does not even mention his name. The façade of the Science Schools towards Exhibition Road is a rich and effective piece of street architecture. The decorative details for the portions of the South Kensington Museum which are complete were mostly designed by Mr. Godfrey Sykes. The general style of the architecture is based on Italian Renaissance with some added richness of detail, for which the extensive employment of terra cotta gave facility. There seems to be some hope that the front of this building may be completed shortly, though no doubt the 'economists' will do all they can to stop it.

At the northern extremity of this consecrated plot of ground we have the Albert Memorial and the Albert Hall, of which the first named, designed by Scott (who received his knighthood on the completion of it), was considered by himself to be his most successful and noteworthy work. His object was, as he himself expressed it, to produce a kind of 'shrine' on a great scale, decorated with the richest and most sumptuous materials. He succeeded in producing this effect of a shrine, but at the expense of scale; the erection is like a small shrine magnified, and never looks its real size, which few spectators realise till after walking up the steps close to it. Another serious defect, unknown to the general spectator, is that as the thing is apparently constructed it would not be secure on so large a scale: the thrust of the arches would tend to overturn the columns at the angles, and the structure is really bound together by concealed iron ties above the arches. This is a great architectural fault. But apart from this the monument is really a remarkable creation of decorative architecture, well seconded by some of its sculptural accessories. The angle group of 'Asia,' by Foley, is very fine; the basreliefs at the base of the monument are very unequal in merit, but those on the south and east sides, by Mr. Armstead, are full of fine points, especially the group on the north-east angle representing the school of French soldier-artists of a former generation, of whom Decamps and Horace Vernet were the prominent figures. The Albert Hall, designed by Captain Fowke, and completed under the superintendence of General Scott (both engineers, not professedly architects), has no artistic claim to rank with the Memorial, but in its main conception it is a building of considerable architectural merit, spoiled by the enormous kind of dish cover put over it in the shape of an iron roof. With the immense abut-

ment obtainable between the double walls which surround the central area, it would have been quite possible to roof it with a solid brick dome with an eye in the centre; this would have been much more costly, but the structure would then have been homogeneous in construction and monumental in character. The frieze round the upper portion, carried out in a coarse but durable mosaic quite suitable at its elevated situation, is one of the first and one of the best of the few modern examples of exterior pictorial decoration in English buildings. By an oversight singularly characteristic of the want of perception in these matters in England, the Hall and the Memorial, closely related as they are in architectural grouping, were not aligned upon the same axis of site; a kind of blunder which in Paris would have brought down ridicule on the head of the architect who had permitted it.

At the south end of the site we are speaking of was erected (1873–1880) the Natural History Museum, the result of the desire on the part of the trustees of the British Museum to dedicate the whole of the older building in Bloomsbury to the constantly increasing demands of their great archæological collection. The plans for this building also were in the first instance made by Captain Fowke, but on his death in 1865 Mr. Waterhouse was called in, who probably declined to work on the lines of Fowke's design; at all events, he designed the building *de novo*. Mr. Waterhouse, it is almost needless to observe, has filled a very large space in English architecture in this generation. His Assize Courts at Manchester, a large and picturesque Gothic building erected at a time when Modern Gothic fervour was at its height, first brought him fame, and he has been engaged since on numberless large buildings in almost every part of England. He may be said to have evolved a variety of Modern Gothic of his own, which is distinct and recognisable, and has been not a little imitated. The Natural History Museum is a sub-variation of this, with a touch of Romanesque character about it, and was the first large building in London faced entirely, inside and out, with terracotta, a material coming much into use of late years in London street architecture. Its advantages are its resistance to the effects of smoke and weather, its fireproof character, and the comparative economy with which decorative enrichment can be produced in it, modelled in the soft clay and then fired; it presents also a richer and warmer tint than most of the building stones of this country. Its

chief disadvantages consist in the difficulty of insuring correct and true line in the work, owing to the shrinkage and often slight twisting of the material in firing, and the necessity of having all decorative detail thought out and modelled beforehand, as no alteration can be made afterwards; whereas stone carving can be executed *in situ* after the blocks are in their places in the building. Great care was taken with the terracotta work for the Natural History Museum, and with satisfactory result, and the entire lining of the walls with this material imparts a very permanent and monumental appearance to the interior. It is, like most of Mr. Waterhouse's buildings, exceedingly well planned, and the central hall, with the upper staircase carried over it on an arch, is a fine interior, rather spoiled, however, in total effect by the employment of iron arches for the roof, which harmonise ill with the solid character of the substructure. The exterior of the building it is, perhaps, not easy to feel enthusiastic about; it is angular and rigid in its lines, and does not produce an architectural effect commensurate with its scale. The City and Guilds of London Institute, facing Exhibition Road, also the work of Mr. Waterhouse, is to our thinking a much more satisfactory exterior, in a style in which Gothic and classic feeling are blended with a good deal of originality of effect. Between the Natural History Museum and the Albert Hall we now see rising the great block of the Imperial Institute building, only half finished at present, but the design has been exhibited and published, and forms a good typical example of the change which has come over English architecture, and London architecture especially, during the last ten or fifteen years. The literal reproduction of Gothic, which followed and drove out the literal reproduction of classic, has in its turn gone to the rear, and the prevalent style is now one which is somewhat based on the forms both of Elizabethan and Jacobean architecture, but with a *cachet* of its own, and which may perhaps be best summed up in the words 'Gothic feeling 'with Renaissance detail;' or, as it is sometimes called, 'Free classic.' Mr. Collcutt, who gained the commission for the building in a limited competition of six eminent architects,* had been long known as a designer of very pic-

* The other five were Mr. (now Sir Arthur) Blomfield, Mr. T. G. Jackson, and Messrs. Aston Webb and Ingress Bell (in collaboration), all of London; Dr. Rowand Anderson, of Edinburgh; and Mr. T. N. Deane, of Dublin; on the principle that the three sister countries

turesque houses and street buildings in a style which was to some extent peculiarly his own; he had not, if we remember right, produced any great building before. The Imperial Institute well represents the same style and character of detail applied to a large building; not forcible, but very refined in taste. It does not display what can be called architectural genius, and owed its position in the competition, perhaps, to its excellent plan; but it will be a satisfactory and pleasing example of the English style of the close of the century. The great tower will be a conspicuous object for a long way round. A French critic has recently remarked that we are the only nation which still retains the tower in its secular architecture; certainly few competition designs in England are considered complete without one.

Among the important London buildings of the earlier part of the century is the Bank of England, in nearly its present exterior form, as remodelled by Sir John Soane; an example of the application of pure classic architecture to a business building which has the merit of dignity and refinement of detail, and of looking like what it is intended for. Soane was a man of some genius; that his taste, as shown in some other works, was very bad from one point of view was as much the fault of his day as of himself. His house in Lincoln's Inn Fields, now the Soane Museum, as an example of an originally devised architect's house, is worth more attention than it receives from a public who hardly know of its existence. The Royal Exchange, the near neighbour of the Bank, was built (1842–4) from the designs of Sir William Tite, an architect whose boast it is said to have been that he had 'made money, inherited money, and married 'money,' but who certainly had neither acquired nor inherited architectural genius. He founded a scholarship, however, in connexion with the Institute of Architects (the 'Tite' prize) for the encouragement of the study of Italian architecture, either from a pure desire that the next generation should be better designers than himself, or from the wish to deal a posthumous blow at the then rising taste for Gothic architecture. Wilkins, a learned, dry, pedantic architect of the early part of the century, with a certain ability, left us

should all be represented. Architecturally speaking, the designs, as a set, were of exceptional excellence, but the competition excited not the slightest public interest; the drawings were exhibited, but no one went to see them. Public indifference on these matters seems to become more dense as the years advance.

the façade of the National Gallery, and the centre portion of University College, furnished with wings subsequently from the design of Professor Hayter Lewis, one of the most learned and respected of the class of architects who are rather students of architecture than practical workers in the field. The enlargement of the National Gallery was carried out by E. M. Barry in a sumptuous though not over refined manner, but with a satisfactory light; and Mr. Ewan Christian is now engaged in tacking on to the back of it the new National Portrait Gallery, which will probably exhibit clever practical treatment of a difficult problem. The Royal Academy rooms were added to old Burlington House about five and twenty years ago by Sydney Smirke, a respectable Royal Academician architect without a spark of genius, the pupil of his elder brother, Sir Robert Smirke, who was equally respectable. Shortly after, or about the same time, Lord Burlington's famous colonnade, before referred to, was taken down, with many promises to put it to some good architectural use elsewhere, which have never been carried out; and the present front to Piccadilly was erected from the designs of Messrs. Banks and Barry, a commonplace piece of classic work, partly redeemed by the dignified proportions of the arched gateway under which all London now drives on private view day at the Academy. The London University, the block of building at the back facing Burlington Gardens, is classic of a very different type, the work of Sir James Pennethorne, who, if he cannot be called an architect of genius, had that degree of knowledge and refined taste in the designing of detail which to some extent supplies the place of genius. The Museum of Geology, in Jermyn Street, is also his work. The British Museum façade (1847) was the work of Sir Robert Smirke; a kind of scenery of columns with wasted space behind them which no one would dream of putting up now, and which is eminently unpractical and unsuited to this climate; yet it cannot be denied, after all, that there is something in the appearance of this classic colonnade which peculiarly impresses one with a sense of the dignity of the institution which is to be found in its rear. The other Smirke (Sydney) carried out the circular reading room, though Sir Antonio Panizzi, the autocratic librarian, claimed the main credit of the design.

The Thames Embankment, though an engineering rather than an architectural work, must not be overlooked as one of the most important constructive changes and improve-

ments of the century. Only the older members of the present generation can realise the immensity of the change which this great piece of work has made in the aspect of this part of London; those who do not remember the river banks before the Embankment may, however, form some idea of it from the present state of the bank opposite, with its expanses of mud at low water, remembering that the bank bordering on Westminster and the Strand district was in much the same condition for some time previous to the formation of the Victoria Embankment. The work was designed and carried out by Sir Joseph Bazalgette, the engineer to the lately extinct Board of Works, which had so unfortunately outlived its reputation. It is a truly remarkable engineering work, both in consideration of its scale and of the difficulties to be contended with in gaining an adequate foundation such as would insure permanence to a work built in a water-laden stratum and exposed to the continual scour of a tidal river. No sign of failure, however, has presented itself during the twenty-one years which have elapsed since the completion of the Embankment. It has furnished a splendid new road for that portion of London, to a considerable extent relieving the crowded traffic on the line of Fleet Street and the Strand, and the land in the rear of the road has become the site for a whole succession of new buildings of very varying architectural merit, and some of them unhappily quite unworthy of so fine a site. A gimcrack hotel faces Blackfriars Bridge, next to which is a building of considerable architectural merit, the new City of London School, in Renaissance style and with a certain amount of originality of detail, designed by Messrs. Davis & Emmanuel. After this comes Sion College Library, a quiet but exceedingly pleasing building in collegiate Gothic style, designed by Sir Arthur Blomfield, exactly the kind of building to illustrate best the quality of good taste and reticence (as it may be expressed) which has always characterised his best work. Temple Chambers (which we observe is not included in Mr. Wheatley's book) is a large building of lawyers' chambers, by the late E. M. Barry, which unfortunately exactly lacks that quality of 'reticence;' it is showy and florid; strange that the *genius loci*, the neighbourhood of the peculiarly quiet old buildings about the Temple precincts, should not have inspired a modern architect with a desire to catch the same spirit. The head quarters of the London School Board is one of the best and most refined buildings on the Embankment; it is certainly not,

however, as Mr. Wheatley tells his readers, 'a red brick Queen 'Anne building, designed by Mr. E. R. Robson;' this is, 'like 'Cerberus,' three mistakes at once: it is not brick; it is not Queen Anne, but modern 'Free Classic;' and it is not designed by Mr. Robson, but by Mr. Bodley. Mr. Robson, subsequently appointed architect to the Board, merely repeated Mr. Bodley's design when the offices had to be enlarged to double their original size, and provided a new entrance doorway. Some blocks of red brick chambers of Late Gothic style, in the vicinity of the School Board Offices, have the negative merit of being inoffensive in taste. Somerset House intervenes here, still unequalled in true architectural dignity and stateliness by any of its new neighbours, the more so in comparison with the wretched piece of commonplace erected immediately on the other side of Waterloo Bridge for the Examination Halls of the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons. Even this, however, is rendered almost respectable in comparison with the big casino called 'the Savoy' next to it, a piece of vulgarity which never ought to have been allowed in such a position. Past Charing Cross Bridge we have Mr. Waterhouse's National Liberal Club and the block called Whitehall Gardens, combined by arrangement into one pile, though Mr. Waterhouse, we believe, is responsible for the special features of the architecture only at the club end, where a circular tower placed at the angle of the site makes a prominent and somewhat effective feature; and the large and broad treatment of the façade facing the river, with its bold arcades, is also to be appreciated. The new Scotland Yard Building, on the site on which Mr. Mapleson's unlucky opera house was commenced, is a powerful-looking square mass designed by Mr. Norman Shaw, who, whatever else he may be, is never commonplace in his architecture. A peculiarity about it is the erection of the lower portion of the walls with grey granite supplied by convict labour, the supply of which being stopped from some official cause, the architect simply went on with brick put on the granite, without even the intervention of a moulding, a piece of naïveté which really adds a good deal to the character of the building.* St. Stephen's Club, by the late Mr.

* This building was recently made the subject of an attack on the Home Secretary in Parliament on the part of Sir William Harcourt, who professed that his refined artistic sense was offended by its peculiarities. Architectural taste only appears in the House of Commons when it can be made an excuse for annoying a political opponent.

Whichcord, closes the Victoria Embankment series with a quiet and inoffensive piece of French Renaissance, and on the opposite side of the river the Albert Embankment is architecturally embellished by the huge succession of blocks of the St. Thomas's Hospital, costly but commonplace architecture, which has the great fault of being deficient in scale, and only looking, from the other side of the river, like a set of ordinary large dwelling houses. It is hardly the business of a hospital to pretend to be architectural, and perhaps a simpler and more purely practical treatment of the building would have had a more satisfactory result even in an architectural sense.

Speaking of the Embankment reminds us of the bridges of London, which are all the work of the present century, and some of them among the finest works, even in an architectural sense, that London can boast. Emphatically may this be said of London Bridge, built by Rennie in 1825–30, and a grand work from the fine sweep of its arches, the monumental solidity of the whole structure, and the entire absence of any impertinent and unnecessary 'ornament,' or what engineers sometimes think to be such. Waterloo Bridge, by the same engineer, and dating about fifteen years earlier (it did not, of course, receive its present name till 1815), is almost equally grand, only having the æsthetic defect of employing a columnar Doric order as a buttress in strengthening the piers, which is a false employment of the columnar form. In London Bridge, Rennie simply left the piers as piers, as masses of masonry, without attempting to work what are falsely called 'architectural features' into them. Would that later engineers had followed his example, instead of inflicting on us such a piece of tawdry vulgarity as Blackfriars Bridge, with its Brobdingnagian granite shafts, magnified colonettes carrying nothing, and its huge, coarse, would-be Gothic carving. To find anything reminding us of the simplicity and solidity of Rennie's bridges we must go up Thames as far as the new Putney Bridge, a really fine granite structure, which is a noteworthy addition to the bridges of London and a credit to the memory of the Board of Works, though it seems to have been merely by some happy accident that a fine bridge got itself built at Putney, for the new Hammersmith Bridge, also built under Board of Works rule, is one of the most horrible pieces of cast-iron vulgarity (painted *to imitate stone*) that was ever produced. Nominally Sir J. Bazalgette was the engineer for both these bridges, but it is morally

impossible that they can have been the product of the same mind.

The clubs of London form a very important section of its architecture, and a compact illustration of the progress and tendencies of English architecture during the last forty or fifty years. The principal buildings of this class belong to the present half century, though two or three date from an earlier period. The United Service Club was one of the earliest of the school of square palatial-looking buildings, based more or less on Italian Renaissance models, which were the favourite ideal during a considerable portion of the great club-building era which made Pall Mall a street of palaces; and though many of these are to a great extent imitative architecture, and there is a certain degree of cold, academical symmetry about them, there is no doubt that their effect, as grouped together in Pall Mall, is exceedingly dignified. The United Service Club was originally designed by Nash in 1826, but the western façade was remodelled by Decimus Burton about 1858, the aim evidently being to assimilate it with the eastern façade of the Athenæum Club, on the opposite side of Waterloo Place, and thus produce a more symmetrical architectural effect. The Athenæum Club was the design, in 1824, of Decimus Burton, an architect who played a much larger part in the architectural work of the early part of the century than Mr. Loftie seems to be aware of, as he speaks of him as just saved from oblivion by his design for the screen at the entrance of Hyde Park. If not a man of genius, he was an architect of very refined taste, and had personal qualities which secured him also a high social position and a large connexion. He was the designer, also, of the Wellington Arch, which his original design showed as surmounted by a *quadriga* group as a finial; and he was deeply chagrined at the absurdity perpetrated in placing on it, sideways, the great clumsy equestrian statue of the Duke, which it took a whole generation to bring down again. The Athenæum Club illustrates perhaps too well the cold classical taste of its day, and it has the defect of looking as if divided into two equal halves, vertically, by the balcony on heavy corbels which runs round it. The Travellers' Club, designed by Barry, is an exquisitely refined study of Italian detail—too refined for this atmosphere, indeed—and with the additional misfortune of being executed in cement only, not in stone. The Reform Club, by the same architect a few years later, is the most severely designed of all the Pall

Mall clubs. It is noticeable how little of ostentation or show there is in these two buildings of Barry's—no columns stuck on, nothing but the mass of wall, the powerful cornice crowning it, and the windows with their simple but refined architectural treatment. Cold it may be called, and one would not wish all street architecture, even in a street of clubs, as formal as this; but in regard to good taste and careful finish of detail it is absolutely unimpeachable: it is emphatically the house architecture of a civilised and refined society. In this respect the Carlton Club, built by Sydney Smirke nearly twenty years later, is an instructive contrast. It is far more ornate and ambitious, but there is a note of ostentation in the piling on of polished granite columns, which are merely ornaments, and have no architectural function whatever, which leaves it somewhat vulgar by the side of Barry's building. The Oxford and Cambridge Club, an earlier work of the two Smirkes conjointly, is free from this defect of ostentation, and it is interesting as exhibiting an at that time rare attempt at the sculptural decoration of a building with basreliefs, which is very commendable; but for all that the impression produced by the Reform Club is superior, from its unity of design and proportion. The Junior Carlton is a building more remarkable for its size than for any higher characteristics. It was the work of Mr. David Brandon, an architect whose real proclivities were Gothic, and who, in conjunction with his brother, Raphael Brandon, was a diligent proselytiser in the Gothic cause by the publication of valuable illustrative works on Gothic architecture, well known to architectural students.* Probably he would not have been allowed to indulge his love of Gothic in a club-house, for though we have said that the London clubs form a kind of illustration of the recent course of architecture in this country, the Gothic movement is little represented among them. There seems always to have been a feeling in favour of classic for clubhouses, and the only frankly Gothic club of any importance in London is Mr. Waterhouse's New University Club, in St. James's Street. The Army and Navy, the next-door neighbour of the Junior Carlton, built by Messrs. Parnell and Smith about 1850, is a rather remarkable building, and one of the most stately and effective clubs in the street. Fergusson calls it 'practically 'a copy of the Cornaro Palace at Venice,' and so in most

* 'Brandon's Analysis of Gothic Architecture,' 'Brandon's Open Timber Roofs of the Middle Ages,' &c.

respects it is; but the omission of the middle story makes all the difference in general proportion, and rather improves it as a composition, getting rid of the repetition in the original design, and giving more importance to the powerfully treated 'rusticated'* lower story, which is practically two stories in the construction, a *mezzanine* being introduced. The 'Army and Navy' avoids the defect apparent in two or three others of these classic clubs, of being divided vertically into two equal halves; the rusticated lower story is the lofty one, and the columnar story is subordinate to it. This halving is undoubtedly the defect of the Conservative Club in St. James's Street, the joint work, about 1845, of Sydney Smirke and Basevi (the latter an Anglo-Italian, and pupil of Sir John Soane)—a formal composition, devoid of interest. Arthur's, which is an early club, built by one Hopper in 1825—a lofty plain ground story with a Corinthian order above—is better proportioned in its parts, and for its date, and in a formal way, is a graceful and pleasing front.

A different and more commonplace style of florid classic, with bad carved ornament, is illustrated in such clubs as the Thatched House and the Junior United Service, a sad fall from the dignified style and correct detail of the older Pall Mall clubhouses. Still worse is the tawdry vulgarity of the club next Marlborough House, now, we believe, called the 'Unionist,' but which has been through two or three phases since its erection some twelve or fifteen years ago. More recently club architecture has taken a new departure in such buildings as the National Liberal Club, before referred to, and Mr. Edis's Constitutional Club, in Northumberland Avenue, which latter is in the new London free classic style, with gables giving a varied skyline, and with a general expression of picturesqueness quite distinct from the staid and sober refinement of the older Pall Mall clubs. Architecture, however, inevitably reflects more or less the social conditions and changes of the day; and these huge club buildings, little distinguishable from monster hotels in their general appearance, are the outward and visible sign of a new departure in London club life, where the club is no

* Rusticated masonry, in architectural parlance, is masonry with the joints or separate stones strongly emphasised in one or other of various ways. Ruskin chooses to speak of the device with profound contempt (in the 'Stones of Venice'), but it is often a great resource in giving power and contrast to an architectural design.

longer the home of a select society, but a huge caravanserai for the accommodation of the politically faithful of either party, without any too nice discrimination of social distinctions. A comparison of the buildings for these two clubs with those of the Travellers' and the Reform gives the architectural index of something like a social revolution.

Architecturally speaking, the monster hotel, in combination with the monster club, is assuming a formidable and threatening aspect in modern London. There is something about the influences under which a hotel is built which seems to crush out anything like architectural refinement. There is a deadly commonplace about this class of buildings from which the mind recoils. Who does not know their average characteristics; the rows of windows with commonplace ornament, the paltry balcony railings affixed to the window sills, the pavilion roofs with ornamental cresting on the top, the general look of cheap show in the whole thing, and of hurried building, without time for the design or execution of refined detail? The St. Pancras Hotel, though by a master of Gothic architecture, only shows Gothic vulgarised; the Charing Cross and Cannon Street Hotels are no better; the Paddington and Grosvenor Hotels much worse; and the neighbourhood of Northumberland Avenue is overshadowed by great masses of architectural commonplace, in the shape of the Métropole and the Grand Hotel. This is architecture built purely for the sake of percentage returns, nor can there be any change for the better until the public learn to recognise and to demand good architecture in our streets, as something worth having and waiting for; for good architecture cannot be produced by hurried building against time.

The modern system of building houses in flats, which might afford, and has in some instances afforded, such opportunities to the architect in the treatment of street houses, has also in too many cases become architecturally a curse instead of a blessing. The unrestricted desire to make the most, financially, out of the area of ground built upon has led to the erection of monstrous mill-like buildings, overshadowing the streets and stopping out air and sunlight. Victoria Street is one of the most flagrant examples of this; it might have been an exceptionally fine street; as it is, it is one of the most dull, grim, and dreary streets to be found in any great city, lined with long and lofty blocks of offices and houses, in which the same doors and windows are repeated *ad infinitum*, and the buildings

carried so high as to block out all sunlight from the roadway.

The preposterous brick pile of Queen Anne's Mansions, not far off, is another gigantic excrescence. Towards the east end of Victoria Street one or two attempts have been made lately, as in St. Margaret's Mansions, at something a little more picturesque and interesting in an architectural sense, but the rest remains truly 'the long unlovely 'street,' a lane of buildings destitute of interest or variety. The habit of building up such houses or 'chambers' to an unconscionable height has architecturally spoiled both Victoria Street and Northumberland Avenue; there is a certain proportion to be observed between the width of the street and the height of the houses which flank it, which has been entirely overlooked; for an impressive and stately street, a height equal to the extreme width of the roadway should be the limit, and less than that is better; otherwise the street, however ornate and costly may be the buildings, is only a narrow lane on a large scale. This passion for lofty buildings (carried to excess in the enormous pile recently erected near Albert Gate) leads to insanitary as well as to unarchitectural conditions. Overcrowding in a vertical direction is still overcrowding, with much the same results as in a horizontal direction; and if this tendency to build high goes on, it will infallibly become necessary, in regard to public health, to space buildings further apart than at present; it is of no use to suppose that the increasing numbers in London can be accommodated in the same area by merely arranging to house them in layers one over the other. A certain maximum of persons only can exist healthily within a certain area, as sanitary statistics have long shown; and no special method of packing them will evade this condition. There are exceptional instances in which the erection of houses in flats in London has been made the occasion for a fine and picturesque architectural treatment, as in Mr. Norman Shaw's 'Albert Mansions,' close to the Albert Hall, in which, without any ostentatious striving after effect, a picturesque character is imparted to the front by very simple means—setting some portions of the wall back and carrying arches over the space, thus at once giving incident and shadow to what might otherwise have been a somewhat mill-like façade; and there have been other successful attempts of the same kind in different parts of the town.

Of great town mansions there are not many to be cre-

dited to this century; those who desire and can afford to keep up such houses mostly belong to families whose town residences have been built at an earlier period. Two important mansions may be mentioned: Bridgewater House, overlooking the Green Park, built from the designs of Sir Charles Barry about the middle of the century; and Dorchester House, in Park Lane, built about the same time from the designs of the late Mr. Vulliamy, for many years architect to the Board of Works. Both houses are founded on the Italian palace form of mansion, a plain cube of building with a great cornice as its crowning feature. Fergusson observes that Bridgewater House 'shows how much can be 'done by a little grouping of the windows and taste in the 'details, with the usual elements of an English nobleman's 'house, without the useless porticoes which the previous 'century thought such indispensable adjuncts.' This is true to a certain extent; the building has the merit of dignity obtained without the use of any such adventitious features as columns or pilasters clapped on; it is simply a great house with its windows symmetrically spaced and accentuated by the usual Italian style of window architraves and pediments; but one may be allowed to think that something more than this might have been achieved within the same limits of taste; the design is rather formal and mechanical looking, and the panelling between the attic windows is not a very recondite form of architectural decoration.

But in regard to average street dwelling houses of the better class (not in flats) the tale is a very different one. The architectural improvement in this class of building of late years has been very remarkable and very gratifying. In the beginning of the century the accepted style of house for a good residential street was such as that of Harley and Wimpole Streets, and some of the Mayfair streets; these date from rather before the century, but the same style of plain brick building was still in vogue, as shown in Russell Square and other parts of the Bloomsbury neighbourhood, which date from the early part of this century. These old brick street houses are not without evidence of a certain degree of architectural taste and perception, as, for instance, in the varied and sometimes very graceful treatment of the details of the entrance doors and doorways. To this succeeded the age of cement, or (when something better could be afforded) of 'handsome' stone houses, only better than the cement ones in that they were built of a nobler and more permanent material. Carlton Terrace and Belgrave

Square, built much about the same period, are examples of what the higher class street architecture of their day could reach to. Belgrave Square has a certain merit in its spaciousness, and in the treatment of its angles, each with its separate mansion placed at an angle of forty-five degrees with the main lines of the square, which is really a good architectural point and worth noting. Basevi and Hardwick between them were the architects responsible for the laying out of this square. Grosvenor Place, a good many years later, is an example of the kind of buildings which came into the category of 'handsome' houses; terrible adjective, the meaning of which is only too well known to the architectural artist. The neighbourhood of the east end of Cromwell Road, too, has developed the same class of street mansion, with regulation porticoes, all alike in a row, and 'ornamental' details of the most tawdry description, while Cromwell Road itself is a long lane of architectural commonplace. The same spirit haunts us in and about the cemented squares of Bayswater and the region to the north of Hyde Park. In none of the street houses of this date is there a particle of architectural interest, of home-like character.

The change which has appeared in the more recent streets and squares (or 'gardens,' the favourite modern term) is truly remarkable. We see cement discarded at last, and the old London material, brick—durable in substance and warm in colour—once more adopted, in a manner founded upon the eighteenth century style, but in many cases developing into an architectural picturesqueness and variety to which eighteenth century London architecture was quite a stranger. There is no doubt a certain amount of mere copying of the eighteenth century London house going on, of which one of the most thorough and typical examples is to be found in the large house built, from the designs of Mr. Norman Shaw, in Queen's Gate, opposite the end of Elvaston Place. This kind of thing is, of course, a mere archæological revival, with which sentiment has more to do than architectural taste. But in a great part of the modern brick house-building of London there is much more than mere archæological sentiment. On the Chelsea Embankment, in Harrington Gardens, Collingham Gardens, and other portions of the Earl's Court neighbourhood, in the still unfinished Kensington Court, in the new houses in the neighbourhood of Cadogan Square and Sloane Street, in Mr. Norman Shaw's charming building at the corner of St. James's Street and Pall

Mall, we find at the present moment a brick street architecture growing up which is at once suitable and picturesque, capable of fine effects in combination, and varied in detail, so as to give to each house its own character and individuality. Among the architects whose names are most prominently connected with this revival of the picturesque of city domestic architecture are Mr. Norman Shaw, Mr. Ernest George, and Mr. J. J. Stevenson; while Mr. Collcutt, the architect of the Imperial Institute, has also given us the one picturesque theatre façade of London—that of the English Opera House in Shaftesbury Avenue. Nor ought we to forget, in speaking of the modern brick architecture of London, the series of schools erected for the London School Board by Mr. E. R. Robson, their architect during many years; buildings also founded on the old London brick style, but treated with a remarkable degree of picturesque and characteristic variety, and which form an important series of architectural additions to the eastern, northern, and southern quarters of London. It is of course difficult to prophesy how this outgrowth of modern brick architecture may be regarded by our descendants in the next century. It may be argued, perhaps, that this is merely the last new fashion, and that those who live at the close of the twentieth century will look back on it with as much indifference as that with which we now regard the stuccoed fronts of the earlier part of the present century. But we venture to think this is a mistake. *Sunt certi denique fines*: there is something beyond fashion, even in modern architecture; and the architectural historian of the next century, looking back on this *fin de siècle* period, if he records that we were totally wanting in national pride in our public architecture, that we left behind us unwieldy and inconvenient mediæval law courts and scamped and paltry public offices, will at least be able to add the saving clause—'but they knew how to build street houses.'

ART. VIII.—1. *Journal of George Fox.* Seventh Edition. In 2 vols. London: 1803.

2. *The Journal of John Woolman,* with an Introduction. By JOHN G. WHITTIER. Glasgow: 1883.

3. *The Quakers.* By FREDERICK STORRS TURNER. London: 1889.

4. *Quaker Strongholds.* By CAROLINE EMILIA STEPHEN. London: 1890.

5. *The Lives of George Fox, Robert Barclay,* and other eminent Quakers in the *Dictionary of National Biography* so far as completed.

THE period of the Commonwealth of England was marked, as is well known, by an eruption of religious fanaticism, and a conflict of sects not less violent than the political struggle which overthrew the monarchy. Beside the great parties of the Presbyterians and the Independents, a host of enthusiasts sprang to life, animated by wild intolerant religious passion, and a restless energy with no definite aim or object. But there were examples, even among them, of genuine Christian principles and aspirations destined, after due preliminary fermentation, to assume permanent forms in the religious life of England. Those who care to examine carefully this black list of sectaries, will discover principles and impulses which gave life and movement to most of our nonconformist bodies; but especially they may trace the starting point and generating energy which found expression in the life and works of George Fox, and under his guidance created the sect of Friends or Quakers.

The history of Quakerism has often been written both from a friendly and from a hostile standpoint; and it forms no part of our design to retell the story. Our object is the more modest one of endeavouring to ascertain the conditions and evidences of religious vitality to be found in the history of the Quakers, and what grounds there are for supposing that these conditions or modifications of them are operative in the present, and whether they justify a forecast of continued and increased vitality in the future. Opportunely for our purpose, these two aspects of the question have been recently treated in a very fair and able manner in the two books of Mr. Turner and Miss Stephen whose titles stand at the head of this paper. The former gives us a sympathetic but discriminating history of Quakerism in the past, while

the latter in her 'Quaker Strongholds' sets forth in a thoughtful and attractive manner certain rudimentary principles of the sect which seem to indicate continued life and progress in the future.

A curious but condign Nemesis seems to have overtaken the history of the Early Quakers. Their fanatic opposition to what they were pleased to consider externalities in others, their estimate of other religionists by the outward badges of creed and conduct, have recoiled upon themselves. They have been for the most part judged by their own externalities, by the overt eccentricities in deed and word of their most vehement sectaries. Men have failed, or at least declined, to probe beneath the surface of the wild fanaticism in order to explore the principles energising beneath. They have taken the scum and froth for the essence of the fermenting spirit. All our forefathers knew, probably all they cared to know, of Fox, Barclay, and the Early Quakers was their eccentricities and extravagances, their affectations and mannerisms in speech and conduct. They were crazy-brained fanatics, moved by uncontrollable impulses to protest against the religion of others or testify their own faith by sensational—often by revoltingly indecent—methods. Fox, e.g., was moved to perambulate the streets of Lichfield on market day barefooted, and crying out at the top of his voice, 'Woe to the bloody city!' Robert Barclay was similarly inspired to go clothed in sackcloth and sprinkled with ashes through the streets of Aberdeen, calling the people to repentance. Robert Huntingdon 'was moved of 'the Lord to go into Carlisle steeplehouse with a white 'sheet about him, among the great Presbyterians there, to 'show them that the surplice was coming up again, and he 'put an halter about his neck to show them that an halter 'was coming upon them.' Richard Sale was moved to go to the steeplehouse in time of worship, and to carry those persecuting priests and people a lantern and candle as a figure of their darkness. Others, like William Sympson and Samuel Fisher, were moved to strip themselves naked as a still more startling method of emphasising their testimony. No doubt these vagaries were neither so strange nor so offensive in the days of the Commonwealth as they would be in our own time. Religious zeal or overmastering conviction were then principles which were held to justify every impassioned or unregulated impulse, and every eccentricity and lawlessness of conduct. But the mischief of these aberrations on the part of the Quakers was incalcul-

able, and may be said to be operative even in our own day. Not only did they draw off the attention of even thoughtful men from the saner and true principles of the sect, but they served to disguise and even to falsify the real significance of those principles. Mr. Turner remarks:—

'As Fox's single extravagance at Lichfield is outweighed by the whole influence of a long and consistently sober-minded life, as Robert Barclay's sackcloth day in Aberdeen is counterbalanced by the years of grave piety and solid scholarship of which his great "Apology" was the fruit, so the fanaticism of Quakerism taken at its worst was but a small fraction of a great spiritual force, &c.'

We readily accept this as a statement of the justice of the case, but we demur to it as a representation of its popular estimate. For one non-Quaker inquirer who derived his knowledge of Fox and Barclay from the 'Journal' of the former or the 'Apology' of the latter, there were probably fifty who took their impressions from the recorded examples of the fanaticism of those leaders and their fellow sectaries. Little or no attempt was made to discriminate between the germ of Quakerism and its occasionally portentous fruitage —between the accidental exaggeration or perversion of a true, and the natural outcome of a false, principle. The Philosophy of Religion was a science then unborn, and the judicial temperament which it creates and necessitates was almost as foreign to English thought as the universal toleration of our own time was to its practice. Besides the defective appreciation of Quakerism thus induced, there were striking anomalies in its first manifestation calculated to mislead the most honest and dispassionate observer. Never was there a religious movement whose outward presentations gave so little clue to its real character—nay, more, which suggested meanings of a diametrically opposite kind. To a calm and thoughtful looker-on the mad antics of some of the Quakers, the restlessness of others, the religious peevishness of all, so far from indicating a kinship with their natural congeners, the Quietists, seemed the outcome of savage irreconcileable perverseness. The stress of the sect on petty externalities in attire and conversation could only give the impression of a devout reliance on outward behaviour, the consistent accompaniment of which would have been extreme ritual in worship and ostentation in general conduct. Their refusal to uncover their heads, to adopt harmless conventional titles of courtesy—seemed to indicate a contempt for the first principles of Christianity and civilised life. No wonder the contemporaries of George

Fox were deceived; no wonder that men who disdained to look below the surface of outward word or demeanour regarded his disciples as uncouth beings, who for the gratification of their peevish and headstrong fancies had put themselves out of the pale both of civilisation and religion. No wonder that the prejudice so largely based on these and similar misrepresentations has continued nearly to our own time.

Not, be it remembered, that the prejudice against Early Quakers was based only on their inconsistency nor on their carrying their principles to extremes. Inconsistency was a common characteristic of the time. An age of religious or political ferment is, for the time being, chaotic; its natural outcome is heterogeneousness—a confused clash of antagonisms. No one dreams of requiring consistency from a man in a furious passion or dominated by unreasoning enthusiasm. The Quakers were probably not more inconsistent than other sectaries. Presbyterians, Independents, Antinomians, Fifth-Monarchy Men, Millenarians cared no more for consistency, for homogeneousness of belief and conduct, than they did for reasonableness or moderation. It did not come within their most distant purview. The age itself was one of extremes—extreme men, extreme measures, extreme objects. The policy of extremity was as common in the battlefield as in the council chamber or in the church. Not only was it a counsel of prudence, it was a pledge and proof of sincerity. No crime was more loathsome to the revolutionary fanatic than lukewarmness; no epithet was more bitterly resented than Laodicæanism; no judgement more commonly invoked on all tolerant neutrality than the Apocalyptic punishment of lukewarmness: 'I will spue thee out of my mouth.' That the Quakers were able in this rivalry of religious extravagance to take the first place, that they could claim a supremacy in unrestrained eccentricity above their fellow religionists, can only be ascribed to the position they occupied in relation to the rest.

The Quakers were, in point of fact, the Ishmaelites of the revolutionary sectaries. Their 'hand was against every man, 'and every man's hand against them.' There was no sect or persuasion that shared their sympathies, scarcely even a principle of politics or religion on which they altogether agreed with their fellows. Now, among other religionists and sectaries, from Laudian churchmen downwards, there were beliefs and aims which might be held in common, and which lent themselves to a fair amount of amicable social intercourse. The moderate and liberal churchman e.g. was

found to agree on many points of church polity with Presbyterians. These again were closely allied, in politics at least, with the Independents. There were points of contact between Antinomians and other extreme sects. Millenarians and Fifth-Monarchy Men shared similar beliefs and aspirations. But the Quakers stood alone—the most dissident of dissenters, the most protesting of Protestants. To them all other persuasions and sectaries were alike; they merely differed in their various degrees of error and blameworthiness. The Genevan gown of the Presbyterian was as much a 'rag 'of popery' as the surplice of the clergyman. The Ebenezer or Bethel of the Independents was no less obnoxious than the 'steeplehouse' of the Episcopalians; in fact, it was the same building minus the steeple. The total immersion of Baptists was as much a 'form and shadow' as the sacraments of the church. The Quakers, in short, like Hal of the Wynd in Scott's novel, 'fought for their own hand.' Christendom was divisible into but two sections—the Quakers and the unbelievers. It was then, as in the days of Noah—a world perishing in a deluge of sin, while the small minority in the ark rode safely on the dark and swollen waters.

There could be but one practical outcome of this position—the result common to all small self-righteous sects from the Montanists to our own day—pride and intolerance.

Toleration, we need hardly say, was at that time not a rare, unrecognised virtue, it was itself a most heinous crime. 'Gangræna' Edwards exhausts his lavish vocabulary of vituperation in describing its enormities. 'Toleration,' he exclaims, 'is the grand design of the Devil, his masterpiece 'and chief engine he works by at this time to uphold his 'tottering kingdom,' &c. In this respect there was little to choose between the more vehement and bigoted sectaries. Where each claimed an exclusive possession of the truth, the toleration of others was merely a sanction of deadly error. Intolerance was thus a primary condition of fealty to truth. There was indeed no other method in the severe struggle of sectarian existence by which a sect could demonstrate its vitality but by vituperative speech in word or in writing. In this respect there was little to choose between a narrow-minded Prelatist and a fierce Anabaptist. But the form which sectarian intolerance and demonstrativeness took among Quakers was peculiarly aggravating. They were not satisfied with words, they 'bore testimony' against the rest of the world by what they were pleased to call 'signs,' but which were in reality violent breaches of order and outrages

on common decency. Some of these we have already noticed, and those of our readers who may desire a fuller account may be referred to the seventh chapter of Mr. Turner's 'History,' wherein he has collected, as in a chamber of horrors, the strange aberrations of the Early Quaker enthusiasts.

But it is time to turn to the leaven which produced all this ferment—the well-known doctrine of the Inner Light.

It has been said that this doctrine was not at first set forth as a substitute for Bible teaching, but was afterwards adopted as an extension of or inference from it. It is certain, however, that it soon assumed a position of superiority, not only to the written word of Scripture but to the general teaching of Christian tradition. It was the spirit versus the letter, the Divine witness as opposed to human testimony. The principle has received so much elucidation since the days of George Fox that it seems superfluous to discuss it here, even if the pages of a critical journal were the fittest place for the treatment of so theological a subject. That the teaching was not a novel one, that it was in effect one of the oldest truths in general religious history, and one of the most fundamental doctrines in Christianity, has long been acknowledged. Nor has its effect as the central dogma and chief energising force of Quakerism been less recognised. It approved itself as a potent spirit capable in moderation of imparting strength, but certain in perverted excess of inducing intoxication and madness. The real genesis of the principle as accepted by George Fox and his followers must be looked for in the general teachings of the revolutionary sectaries. An assumption of special and Divine illumination is the starting point of almost every one, as the student of Edwards's 'Gangræna' may readily ascertain for himself.

Here it may suffice to remark in reference to the early Quakers that the two points in which the principle received special developement from the teachings of George Fox and Robert Barclay were: (1) its differentiation as a supernatural principle from every species of ordinary human faculty such as conscience or reason; and (2) its extension, in harmony with the text John i. 9, to every man born into the world.

The effect of this principle in the varied energies of the Quakers is the point of most interest in their history. While it tended in the cases of excitable and mentally ill-balanced men and women to excessive individualism issuing in outbreaks of disorder and fanaticism, its general result was to

engender a spirit of independence and self-assertion which in an age of conflicting extremes was by no means void of utility. Equalising the original endowment of men, it was a protest against privilege and monopoly both in Church and State. The principle was the more powerful in that it was independent of human or purely secular conditions. The *seed* was Divine in its origin and developement. Its authority was as universal as it was supreme and unquestionable. No wonder the Presbyterians and Independents, from their standpoints of election, special grace, &c., opposed the levelling sectaries. Their opposition as a whole was more bitter than the hostility of the prelatic divines, many of whom were Arminians. The characteristic of Fox which they especially detested was not his eccentricities of speech and deportment, but his extreme catholicity. No 'heretical 'pravity' was so depraved in the eyes of the genuine Calvinists as the assertion of human equality in the sight of God; and Fox, we must remember, went farther than this. According to him every man, even the most benighted, was gifted with a Divine, supernaturally originated light, which it was his duty to find, recognise, and, with God's help, develope. George Fox, we may be certain, had never read Plato—we may even fear that the narrowness which excluded all culture from his purview of Christian training would have made the perusal of one of the Socratic Dialogues a positive sin—but his principles and method have no small resemblance to those of the great Hellenic thinker. His appeal to men to discover and educe the light within them resembled the appeal of Socrates to his countrymen to be guided by the inborn principles of justice and truth bequeathed to them by their prior existence, and which needed not origination, but only reminiscence.

It is only another form of the same truth that recognises in Quakerism a further or extreme stage of Protestantism. How far Archbishop Laud and his followers really intended to proceed in a Romeward direction may be regarded as doubtful. Recent and ampler investigation has thrown some doubt as to the extent of the alleged deviation. What is, however, incontestable, and is confirmed by Professor Gardiner's latest investigations, is that the High Church party were engaged in a deliberate system of ecclesiastical tyranny. But it is equally incontestable that Presbyterians, Independents, and Cromwellians were no less committed to schemes of spiritual tyranny. Quakerism was in reality a protest against both, nay, against

every form of spiritual oppression. It refused the authority of the priest, but it refused no less decisively the self-arrogated claim of the presbyter, 'old priest writ large,' as no one discerned more clearly than George Fox. It equalised, though in a wild, haphazard fashion, the claims of aspirants to become religious teachers. Instead of external qualifications and secular accomplishments, all that the genuine evangelist needed was a developement of that inward illumination he had in common with all men. That the culture thus sanctioned was narrow and fanatical, that it induced disorders and excesses of the most mischievous kind, is as much a fact of history as an obvious inference from the probabilities of the case. On the other hand, the principle of the inner light helped to diminish the excessive and often perverted stress on the mere letter of Scripture. To our freer and, we must hope, not less religious, culture, nothing in the liberation of the Bible by the Reformation seems more repugnant than this unlettered literalism. Nothing could be more perverse, more fatal to mental and spiritual progress, than the combined ignorance and narrowness which the sectaries as a rule brought to the interpretation of the Bible. The Illumination which the Sacred Text, rightly used, was calculated to impart was transformed into positive darkness by the pettiness which guided its exegesis, which tried to enforce its casual and minor injunctions, which attempted to take it as an absolute rule of science and secular wisdom, which propounded its political or ecclesiastical politics as authoritative exemplars for all time. Episcopalians were protected from the extreme consequences of this literalism by the theory of a divinely inspired and directed Church. Far more potent, however, in the same direction was the inner light, the individual inspiration, of the Quakers. It was at once a verdict of private judgement and a rule of Scriptural exegesis. It imparted a breadth and freedom to interpretation which probably no other principle could have so well secured. That in practice it had its drawbacks must be granted, but as an antagonistic influence to a mere slavish literalism its value as a theory is indisputable. Not the least of its merits was that it discriminated between the spirit and letter, between Christ the living, and Scripture the written, Word, between the real and the phenomenal, between the intention of the sacred writer and the frequently imperfect vehicle employed in its communication.

But the doctrine of the inner light and its universality

produced also another effect. It originated and stimulated juster and loftier ideas of the co-equality of all men before God than had existed before. The ecclesiastical standpoint of the extreme Prelatist, the predestinarian standpoint of Presbyterian and Independent, resembled each other in this, that they were founded on a principle of monopoly and exclusiveness. This was the common position of all the sectaries, and was for a time shared, as we have seen, by the Quakers themselves. Soon, however, 'the seed,' as it was properly called, began to germinate in the case of the latter. The natural inference from a common possession of a sacred and supernatural principle was too obvious to be resisted. From indicating a relation to God, it soon came to signify and enforce a mutual relation among men. It became, in other words, a principle of philanthropy and humanitarianism. The consequences of this extension form one of the most creditable features in the history of the Friends, which we shall presently have to notice. Here the broad fact may suffice that, of all the forms of Christianity which existed in England in the seventeenth century, the Quakers may claim to be the first among whom schemes of much needed social and political amelioration took root, not as schemes of vague theorising, but as enterprises of practical imperiousness.

Having thus touched upon the main starting points of Quakerism, we proceed to glance at their developement in the evolution of the sect. This developement is at once the most remarkable and most creditable feature of Quaker history, whether we consider the sect as a body or its more eminent members as individuals. The sectarian wild-oat sowing, which is so pronounced in the case of the Friends, subsides into a calm placid serenity, unexampled in the evolution of any other body of English Christians. The vehemently fermenting spirit, with its natural products of froth and scum, is gradually transformed into a potent liquor, becoming continually clearer and stronger as it reaches its mellow maturity. Passing from the first years of George Fox's activity, with its unseemly violence and eccentricity, its perpetual outrages on the religious belief and social usages of his fellow Englishmen, to the later years of his life, is like passing from a savage desert into a cultivated region. And what is true of the founder and his friends is true also of the corporate body. With the formation of the sect the individual eccentricities of its leaders disappeared. As Dr. Hatch said of the early Church: 'When it was founded prophesying ceased,'

Not that all this preliminary turbulence was unallied, as some writers have alleged, with the vital spirit of Quakerism. The central doctrine of the early Quakers, their belief in personal illumination, the individualism naturally gendered by such a belief, itself suggested in excitable persons abnormal forms of expression. Why the collar of a coat should be deemed obnoxious, or why hooks and eyes should be a more becoming method of fastening clothes than buttons, or why grey and drab should be preferable to other colours, might puzzle a casuist of our own time to determine; but these visible signs were not empty symbols, having little connexion with doctrinal phases of belief: on the contrary, they indicated opinions and preferences, based, however, though somewhat perversely, upon their profoundest convictions. Hence, when Lord Macaulay says, in his 'Essay on Milton,' 'most of their absurdities were mere external badges, 'like the signs of Freemasons or the dresses of friars,' he seems to us to lack, in an unusual degree, his customary perspicacity. Setting aside, as obviously at variance with truth, the notion that the dresses of friars were mere external badges, it is clear that the modes of dress adopted by the Quakers had definite principles and reasons to recommend them. We do not presume to affirm that these reasons are wholly sufficient to justify the adoption of what soon came to be regarded as a sectarian livery. It is one of the many anomalies in the early structure of Quakerism that its leaders did not discern the prohibition of a religious and separatist uniform in the Divine judgement passed on the Pharisees for their long broad-bordered garments and ostentatious phylacteries. But, at all events, the Quaker dress was not a meaningless external badge. We must regard it as a protest against the pomps and affectations of fashionable attiré, and particularly against the extravagances which marked the Restoration. Though some of its effects were grotesque, and savoured of affectation, it is impossible to deny the congruity between attire of neutral tints, without visible ornament of any kind, and the quiet routine of a life thoroughly disciplined by religious self-restraint and wholly removed from passion and excitement, a demeanour of extreme simplicity and placidity, and a conversation entirely free from violent or highly coloured language.

Of far more importance in the history of Quakerism is the developement of its first principles in the direction of human justice and freedom. Few, indeed, are the con-

spicuous advances in our English life and legislation, the reformations of crying abuses, &c., in which Quakers, individually and as a religious body, have not taken the lead. It is to the eternal honour of the Early Quakers, George Fox, John Woolman, and others, that they not only made a stand against slavery, urging Quaker slaveowners to free their slaves, but they contributed largely to awaken the conscience of England and of Europe, and, in course of time, produced the sense of justice which led to the emancipation of slaves in our own country and the colonies. No less honourable is the protest they made against the ruthless severity of our English penal law, the hardening effect of long imprisonments, and the undue frequency of capital punishment. Probably few passages in George Fox's journal are more characteristic of his spirit and his methods than the following:—

'Moreover, I laid before the judges what an hurtful thing it was that prisoners should lie so long in jail, showing how they learned wickedness one of another in talking of their bad deeds: and therefore speedy justice should be done.'

'While I was here in prison,' he continues, 'there was a young woman in the jail for robbing her master of some money. When she was to be tried for her life, I wrote to the judge and to the jury about her, showing them how it was contrary to the law of God in old time to put people to death for stealing, and moving them to show mercy. Yet she was condemned to die and a grave was made for her, and at the time appointed she was carried forth to execution. Then I wrote a few words warning all people to beware of greediness or covetousness, for it leads from God, and exhorting all to fear the Lord, to avoid all earthly lusts, and to prize their time while they have it. This I gave to be read at the gallows, and though they had her upon the ladder with a cloth bound over her face ready to be turned off, yet they did not put her to death, but brought her back again to prison, and in the prison she afterwards came to be convinced of God's everlasting truth.' (Vol. i. p. 96.)

The reformation of our prison management, and the amelioration of the condition of prisoners, both while in custody and after their liberation, is another field of beneficent energy which owes more to Quakers than to any one religious body in England. In this connexion the hallowed name of Elizabeth Fry will ever occupy in English records of social meliorism a niche next to that of John Howard the philanthropist. In the sympathetic life of Mrs. Fry contributed to the 'Dictionary of National Biography' we have a striking picture of the effects of her ministrations among the female prisoners in Newgate. The American

minister of the day thus describes a scene of which he had been eye-witness :—

'Two days ago I saw the greatest curiosity in London, ay, and in England too, compared to which Westminster Abbey, the Tower, Somerset House, the British Museum, nay, Parliament itself, sink into utter insignificance. I have seen Elizabeth Fry in Newgate, and I have witnessed there the miraculous effect of true Christianity upon the most depraved of human beings, . . . and yet the wretched outcasts have been tamed and subdued by the Christian eloquence of Mrs. Fry.'

Of the other directions of human beneficence which Quaker philanthropy took, their larger efforts among all European nations to avert war and promote peace, their lesser energies to found hospitals, refuges, schools, &c., we have no further space to speak. Mr. Turner well remarks, speaking of Woolman's anti-slavery efforts :—

'Human history presents few parallels to this triumph of the Spirit of Christ over selfishness and evil custom. If the other Christian churches had wielded Woolman's weapons and won his victory, what a sad and bloody chapter in the history of America would have been escaped.' (P. 284.)

We cannot refrain from quoting the tribute which follows :—

'In John Woolman and Anthony Benezet, Quaker philanthropy became conspicuously brilliant. Thenceforth the wellspring of Quaker beneficence has never run dry. In the lives of Grellet and Allen, Joseph Sturge, Elizabeth Fry, and many more, it flowed on, and still it flows, proving that, whatever the defects of the Quaker form of Christianity, it has learned this lesson well: that to be a Christian is to live in this world after the manner of Him who went about doing good.'

That the Quakers increased largely during the seventeenth and the first two decades of the eighteenth century is a well-known fact of our religious history. The precise extent of this increase is, however, not easily determined. Statistics have never been a strong point among the Friends. As Mr. Rowntree remarks, in his 'Quakerism Past and 'Present,' 'No attempt at defining *membership* with the 'Society of Friends was made until nearly a century after its 'origin, . . . though it has kept careful records of births, 'deaths, and marriages.' He quotes the 'Snake in the 'Grass,' as mentioning that the Quakers are not fewer, by the lowest computation, than one hundred thousand here in England. This, Mr. Rowntree thinks, is an overestimate; and from other sources, including the records of

the Society at Devonshire House, London, he arrives at the conclusion that it must have numbered at the end of the seventeenth century about sixty-six thousand. This more moderate estimate, which seems to us amply justified, is, it must be allowed, an enormous outcome of a propaganda, extending only over half a century, and carried on mostly by ignorant and uncultured fanatics. But the reasons for its success are not far to seek. The Quaker movement was in touch with every sentiment and activity pertaining to the Revolution. Its initial principle of human equality it not only asserted, but placed on a religious basis. It represented its wildest extravagances and disorders, but yet found room and ministered aliment to the choice quietistic spirits which, by a merciful compensation, every age of mental unrest and commotion seems to engender. It reproduced the puerile distinctions, the hotheaded intolerance, of the Revolution, all the while it propagated principles calculated to reduce those mischiefs to their fitting nullity. It administered to the unrest of the present, while it cherished germs full of promise of quietude and repose in the future. Besides which, it enjoyed the ascendency which a cruel persecution, borne with wonderful meekness and forbearance, invariably confers on a growing sect; nor was it destitute of the influence which rightly attaches to continued efforts for the political and social welfare of humanity.

But, if Quakerism grew and prospered up to the close of the seventeenth century, the earlier half of the eighteenth was destined to see a change. The Friends became, and that with unexpected rapidity, a dwindling sect. For this many causes have been assigned, some more, some less obvious. The most operative of all was the gradual failure of the fuel needed to sustain the flame of religious zeal. To the spiritual unrest, the many-sided burning enthusiasm, of the seventeenth century succeeded, in due course, the lassitude and coldness of the eighteenth. It was not that the church wanted apostles. George Fox had followers as zealous and unwearied as himself, but the time was not propitious. The religious and political environment had changed. In a heartless and sceptical age like that which followed the Restoration appeals to religious impulses and sensibilities were necessarily 'flat, stale, and unprofitable.' The harpstrings had no longer their old tension, and the tones that feebly vibrated from the relaxed strings were but dissonant echoes of their former high-strained music. Other causes also contributed to the decadence of Quakerism. Mr.

Rowntree lays a great but not undue stress on emigration chiefly as an escape from persecution. How great such a stress might be we may imagine from the bare fact that in 1660 the number of Quakers in prison amounted to 4,200, some estimates even making it 5,000. We cannot wonder at the result that 'about 500 Friends per annum are re-'ported as emigrating between 1676 and 1700.' To these causes of decadence must be added others which pertain to the discipline of the Quaker body. It was an obvious though unhappy result of the root thought of Quakerism—the inner light—that it implied necessarily a high spiritual condition of membership. This induced an extreme severity of discipline, which, however honourable to those who underwent it, was nothing less than suicidal in respect of the progressive vitality of the sect. The conditions thus imposed related not only to moral and spiritual fitness, they descended to petty and unworthy restrictions in respect of dress, language, and demeanour. The effect of this minute scrupulosity — this excessive tithing of the mint, anise, and cumin of social life—on men of broad sympathies and masculine culture was irksome in the extreme. The late Wm. E. Forster used to say that he did not leave the church of his fathers, he was turned out of it; and a similar apology might doubtless have been proffered by hundreds of less eminent persons, victims of the peevish stepmotherly severity of Quaker discipline. A further restriction of the same kind was that on marriage. Every man or woman who married out of the connexion was promptly 'disowned;' in other words, put out of the Quaker synagogue. The effect of these petty and tyrannical restrictions on family and social life, the degrading espionage and suspicion thereby introduced into peaceful domestic circles, need no further particularising. Instead of marvelling at the decadence of Quakerism, one might be justified in wondering that it had any germs of vitality left. Dealing with the statistics of the present century, Mr. Rowntree assures us:—

> 'Upwards of 8,400 persons have resigned their membership or been disowned, and this loss having only been compensated for by the introduction of 6,000 persons through convincement, registration of non-members, readmissions, &c., a melancholy balance of 2,400 remains on the debtor side of the society's balance sheet.'

Mr. Rowntree's book, it should be added, was published in 1859: the intervening thirty years, accompanied by a relaxa-

tion of these petty and servile restrictions, have had a corresponding effect on Quaker statistics, as we shall presently have occasion to notice.

There are other causes of the waning of Quakerism which we have no space to describe. These refer to the divisions and intestine controversies that have sprung up within the sect, both here and in America, from the time of George Fox to our own day. Those of our readers who desire further instruction on this head may be referred to the brief but trustworthy summaries contained in chapters ix. and xvi. of Mr. Turner's History. Here we may notice, as not coming within the province of Mr. Turner's book, the doctrinal dissensions to which has been given the name of the Beacon controversy. It may be described as an offshoot or sequel of the Evangelical revival at the commencement of this century, and resulted from a justifiable refusal on the part of the majority of the Quaker society to subordinate the individual experience as a test of scriptural truth to a dogmatic literalism in the interpretation of the Bible. It is said that from the effects of this last dissension the society has not yet fully recovered.

Coming lastly to the present position of the society, and to what has been termed 'the Revival of Quakerism,' we need hardly insist that by this is in no way meant the resuscitation of the old sect, with its quaint and uncouth features, as it startled the England of the seventeenth century. That is a sheer impossibility. George Fox and his rude methods would be as great an anachronism to-day as, let us say, the Salvation Army big drum will be to our descendants of the twentieth century. His wild dress and leathern breeches are as much out of date as the accoutrements of Cromwell's Ironsides. The externalities of dress and diction which half irritated, half amused, our forefathers, are finally as extinct as their own trunk hose and curiously garnished oaths. History, it is alleged, repeats herself. She occasionally does so, no doubt, but only in her own manner. She does not revive the mouldering corpse of an institution long dead and buried, or requicken forms of life which have perished by the natural process of decay. When she repeats herself the repetition implies some modification or rehabilitement of the former existence. The life may be continuous, but its transmigration, as in the old theory of Pythagoras, is attended by a new form. The words may be similar, but the time has changed. In its old seventeenth century form Quakerism is indisputably dead, but the living germs

that started it into being may put forth a new growth. Assuredly it were a revival of a very momentous kind when the cause from which the demons of superstition and fanaticism have been exorcised is now found, like the man in the gospel, clothed and in its right mind.

That the movement is real seems to be shown (1) by authentic statistics; (2) by various concurrent causes which clearly favour such a revival.

As to the first, we have already seen that the records of Quaker membership show a decided falling off up to the beginning of the century, and the decadence seems to have continued, though with not quite so great a momentum, up to about 1860. Since that date, however, we have clear evidence that at last the tide has turned. It is true that the inflow is as yet not very striking, but at least it is a fact. We cannot afford space for the whole statistics since 1860, but we may not unfairly take those of the last ten years as affording proof that the Quaker body is gradually increasing in numbers, and doubtless proportionately in influence. We may premise that the numbers are taken from the Reports handed in to each yearly meeting, and refer in every case to the year before the given date:—*

| Year | Members | Attenders |
|---|---|---|
| 1881 | 14,981 | 5,041 |
| 1882 | 15,113 | 5,084 |
| 1883 | 15,113 | 5,230 |
| 1884 | 15,219 | 5,380 |
| 1885 | 15,381 | 5,629 |
| 1886 | 15,380 | 5,629 |
| 1887 | 15,453 | 5,803 |
| 1888 | 15,531 | 5,878 |
| 1889 | 15,574 | 6,048 |
| 1890 | 15,836 | 6,110 |

* In order to bring up the tabulated statistics of English Quakerism given above to their most recent date, it seems desirable to append those of the past year, which we extract from the 'Summary of the Tabular 'Returns for 1890' presented to the Society at their annual meeting in May last. Our readers will observe that they indicate a continuance of progress in a similar ratio to that of the ten previous years. The number of members of monthly meetings on December 31, 1890, was 15,961, being an increase of 125 on the number reported last year. The number of habitual attenders reported is 6,120, an increase of ten upon last year's return. The number of particular meetings reported in the tabular returns this year is 324 as against 316 last year.

This increase, though only moderate in itself, is the more significant because it takes the place of an annual and rapid falling off, and is owing chiefly to an increase of admissions from the outside. That this has not resulted from new proselytising efforts may be taken for granted. For obvious reasons connected with the fundamental principles of the sect—e.g. their exclusive insistence on freedom and spontaneity in all matters of religious profession—the Quakers have never been ardent proselytisers. At the same time this turn in the tide may claim to be in a great measure the result, however indirect, of fresh efforts in the cause of philanthropy and social amelioration. Besides the philanthropic activities already mentioned, the Friends set themselves at the beginning of the century to the task of religious education. They established at various centres Sunday schools (that in Bristol dates from 1810), which seem to have been attended with wonderful success. At first the attendants at these schools consisted of the children of Quaker parents, but the combination of quietness, gentleness, and forbearance, characteristic of Quaker teachers, soon led to an increase from the outside. Of still more efficacy, as explaining the growth of Quakerism, has been the adult schools, which date from about 1845. This important movement has since grown to considerable dimensions, especially in Birmingham, the place of its birth. Here, again, there has been nothing like a system of propagandism. The schools are, as we understand, open to the public at large, and are frequented by many adults who are not Quakers, and who resort to them for purely educational purposes. At the same time it is acknowledged that some of the scholars have joined the Quaker body in every centre where such a work has been earnestly carried on. The adult school movement has led to other combined efforts adapted to keep the members a united body, and to afford them suitable objects on which to expend their zeal. Thus the Friends, who formerly had no foreign missions, have now established them in Madagascar, India, China, and Syria. They have also a medical mission among Armenians in Constantinople. The American Quakers have achieved a similar distinction in the missionary field. If the question be asked from what class of our population present day Quakerism is being mostly recruited, the reply must be, chiefly from the working classes. At the same time we have reason for believing that the more cultured and highly educated classes are beginning to be attracted to the worship

and faith of the Quakers. The form Quakerism may take in highly cultured and religiously sensitive men and women has recently received a striking illustration in Miss Stephen's 'Quaker Strongholds,' a work of which it has been affirmed not unworthily that it is the most important contribution to Quaker apologetics since the celebrated apology of Robert Barclay. The actual position of Quakerism throughout the world is given in the following numbers: Ireland has 2,687 members, which are reported as *not increasing*; Canada claims 1,109 members, who are increasing. The number of Quakers in the United States is given as 81,000, but they are much divided; and in the Western States the distinctive doctrines of Quakerism are wholly obliterated. The scholars now in the Friends' Sunday schools in England and Wales are: Adults, 22,735; juniors, 12,514. The number of schools is 199, and of teachers 1,900. In comparison with the position of the Friends at the commencement of the century, these numbers must certainly claim to represent something akin to the increased vitality which is meant by the term 'Revival.'

But leaving these statistics, which we may remark in passing have been put at our service by leading members of the Quaker body, on whose accuracy we can implicitly rely, to indicate *quantum valeant* their own conclusions, there remain two more points for discussion in relation to our subject. What common ground of Christianity and religious belief do Quakers profess with other Christian churches and sects of our time? How far does the alleged revival of Quakerism find encouragement in the general circumstances and conditions by which it is surrounded? How far, in other words, is it in harmony with the political and social, the moral and intellectual tendencies of the present day? And if this second question must be answered, as we think it must, in a sense favourable to the revival, another point must be incidentally glanced at decided, viz. how far these newer influences are likely to be concentrated and find their sufficing embodiments in the particular system called Quakerism.

With regard to the first point, Quakerism is so little changed in essential principles and motive energy since its first foundation that we may safely recur to its starting point for a determination of its present tendencies. By 'starting point' we do not, however, mean what is implied in the advice given to those who would investigate Quakerism, viz.: 'If you want to know what Quakerism is, read the

'"Journal of George Fox."' What we must now regard as the true starting point of Quakerism is the 'Apology' of Robert Barclay. This remarkable man is related to the founder of Quakerism as the legist and philosopher is to the missionary and preacher. He places the main doctrines of Quakerism in a series, half scholastic, half geometric, of propositions, which he grandiloquently terms 'Theses 'Theologicæ,' and defends them with a philosophic breadth, a spiritual insight, and a many-sided erudition which will always command admiration even when they do not insure conviction. It is to this work that we must refer for such an estimate of Quakerism as will enable us to compare it with other bodies of Christians, and so far to assess its claim as a requickening form of Christian belief and practice. Our space will only allow us to make this comparison in brief terms, but the attempt, involving as it does a main factor in our problem, will not, we think, be uninstructive to our readers. We may summarise our remarks under the heads of (1) the Scriptures; (2) the Church; (3) the Divine mission of Christ, and the doctrines on that subject generally held by Protestants.

As already remarked, the relation of the Quaker doctrine of the inner light to the fact of revelation has always formed a distinguishing feature of their creed, but it has hitherto also formed a conspicuous note of discrimination between Quakers and other bodies of Christians. The attitude of George Fox to the Bible was apparently as inconsistent as anything could well be. Mr. Turner in his History has taken the pains to collect a few of these doctrinal dissonances, with a result that is both amusing and not a little startling. He tells us, e.g. (p. 222)—

'Vehement as were his [Fox's] protests against bondage, to the letter he could be as slavishly literal as any man. He asks whether in primitive times Christians used to set up dancing schools and fencing schools. He demands Scripture for stage plays and shows, for bull baiting and cock fighting, for ninepins and bowls, for football, wrestling, and music—grouping together brutal and innocent amusements. . . . It was not Fox's manner to do things by halves. He read in the Epistle of James, "If ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin," and forthwith bowing, doffing the hat, and other customary tokens of respect are at all cost to be abandoned. There is nothing in the extremes and excesses of Early Quakerism for which Scripture precepts or precedents were not quoted. If one part of the New Testament more than another was constantly in Fox's mind it was the Sermon on the Mount. Two of its precepts, interpreted literally, have been almost the peculiar property of the Quaker society: "Swear not

at all;" "Resist not evil." Another precept of the same sermon, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth," he seldom mentioned, and the Quakers were left to interpret it as they would. Fox could not only neglect a passage of Scripture, but on the strength of one could contradict another . . . he could go further than this, and openly set aside distinct injunctions of Holy Writ, of which that forbidding women to speak in the church and the precepts in respect to baptism and the Lord's Supper are the most notable instances.'

This is doubtless true, and is not ineffectively urged, but the answer from the standpoint of Fox is self-evident. He would place the immediate revelation or inner light of himself and his brethren as the final criterion of Scriptural truth. Indeed, he might go further and urge that a similar liberty of acceptance and rejection in respect of different portions of Holy Writ had been claimed by all Christian churches and sects, even by those who professed to make the Bible the sole basis of their faith. But the position of the Quakers in relation to the Bible was first laid down in distinct and coherent terms by Barclay in his third proposition.

'Nevertheless, because they [the Scriptures] are only a declaration of the Fountain, and not the Fountain itself, therefore they are not to be esteemed the principal ground of all truth and knowledge, nor yet the adequate primary rule of faith and manners. Yet because they give a true and faithful testimony of the first foundation, they are and may be esteemed a secondary rule subordinate to the Spirit, from which they have all their excellency and certainty.'

It is obvious that a rule or standard thus stated, so far from being a *regula fidei*, might easily become a *regula plumbea*, a rule of lead capable of being bent or twisted in any given direction. Indeed, we have only to refer to the 'History of the Quakers' to find examples of such a lax and 'private' interpretation of Scripture. If the spirits of the prophets, according to the favourite Quaker texts, were to be subject to the prophets, their history would tend to prove either that the subjection was imperfect or that conflicting views among individual prophets were occasionally neither rare nor unimportant. On the other hand, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact, duly seen and emphasised by Barclay and other Quaker apologists, that a certain amount of freedom in the handling of Scripture has, rightly or wrongly, been exercised by most Christian churches—nay, the common participation by all devout men in the gift of inspiration cannot be consistently disclaimed by the English Church, seeing that in several of her collects—e.g. that for Whit

Sunday, the fifth Sunday after Easter, and the second collect in the Communion Service—such a claim is put forward in the most direct and explicit terms.

But while Quakers do not differ essentially from other Christian sects as to their views of Scripture, they are separated from them *toto cælo* on the question of Church polity and worship. Comparing Miss Stephen's 'Quaker Strongholds' with the tenth and eleventh propositions of Barclay's 'Apology,' we are able, no doubt, to perceive a growing modification of the uncompromising terms in which the latter denounced all 'set forms' of worship, e.g.:—

'All other worship, both praises, prayers, and preachings, which man sets about in his own will and at his own appointment, which he can both begin and end at his own pleasure, do, or leave undone, as himself sees meet, whether they be a prescribed form, as a liturgy or prayers conceived extemporarily by the natural strength and faculty of the mind, they are all but superstitious will worship and abominable idolatry in the sight of God.'

Yet the essentials of spontaneity, intuitive fitness, and immediate impulse as the authoritative basis of worship are still cherished. Quakers, it is true, have always had 'set times' and for the most part 'set places' of worship even from the time of George Fox; it would almost seem that there is at present a tendency to add 'set persons,' and also the rudiments of 'set forms,' to their other conditions of formal worship. It is to be hoped that these later tendencies will, in the interests of the vitality and wellbeing of their sect, be assiduously and jealously watched.

The cognate difficulty of set forms of belief Quakerism may be said partly to have solved by presenting to the world an example of an avowedly creedless religious body not more 'by schisms rent asunder, by heresies distrest' than other bodies of Christians, with a continuous existence of nearly three centuries. But we must not lose sight of two circumstances which largely account for this anomalous phenomenon. 1. That the Quakers have never professed to have a formal creed or definite articles of faith. The effect of the main teachings of George Fox's 'Journal,' and still more of the dogmatic 'Theses Theologicæ' of Barclay's 'Apology,' has been essentially of a similar kind. We must, however, grant that they have consistently approved themselves less anxious than other sects possessing overt and avowed creeds to quench the spirit in individual and exceptional cases, and the liberty of prophesying which they have cultivated in their own body they have been anxious to

extend as widely as possible. Hence it may be regarded as an outcome of their free standpoint that in all the movements among ourselves which have had for their objects the extension of civil and religious freedom the Quakers have always been found in the vanguard. 2. Another condition which has kept the Quaker body together, in spite of their lack of formal bonds of creed and ritual by which most churches are held in cohesion, seems to depend on their stress on inward qualities, such as spiritual fitness, kindred feelings, and mutual sympathies, as the ground of church membership. Like the Early Christian Church, 'they that 'believe are of one heart and one soul.' This also accounts for their dislike of proselytism, and the extreme care with which new converts are admitted into the full membership of their body.

Little need be added on the Quaker position with reference to the Christian scheme of redemption. Substantially they are in harmony with most other bodies of Christians on the cardinal truths of the historical veracity of Christ's mission and its attendant circumstances. We need hardly say that as respects the Atonement they are staunch universalists, making the redemption by Christ no less than 'the saving 'and spiritual light wherewith every man is enlightened' the common right of all men. They also maintain and cherish the hope of immortality, though for obvious reasons they do not press the doctrine of a physical resurrection. For their purposes few texts have greater potency than this, 'It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.'

Summing up this portion of our subject, the *credenda* of the Quakers, if we may be allowed such a term, may roughly be described as *the general beliefs of evangelical Protestantism, partly determined, partly modified, by the central doctrine of the inner light.* The distinguishing marks of Quakerism in comparison with other Christian communities seem to be these: that they lay greater stress on spiritual freedom, and they provide greater scope for spontaneity in religious feeling and its devout expression. Unless we are mistaken these characteristics mark tendencies discernible in much of our current religious thought. In every direction we seem able to detect a growing impatience of excessive dogma on the purely speculative points of the Christian creed, a higher estimate of spiritual liberty, the need of greater flexibility in formal modes of devotion. So far, therefore, from modern Quakerism being out of touch with other churches and bodies of Christians, it would rather

seem as if here, just as in the field of philanthropy and human amelioration, the Quakers have been the first to indicate courses and forecast directions and energies which other Christians have in time found it expedient to follow and adopt.

Coming now to the other and more general influences and circumstances of our time which seem to favour the revival of Quakerism, we are here again met by the central doctrine of the inner light. Bearing in mind the variety of forms it has assumed in the history not only of Religion but of Philosophy, we may certainly affirm that the stress laid on it by the Quakers has, with other more general causes, conduced to its present recognition by all classes of Christians alike. It has always seemed to us a curious phenomenon that a doctrine of such general truth and efficacy should have been regarded by English Christians as a peculiarity of Quakerism. Now, at all events, this is no longer the case. The limits of a single and small sect could no more contain a teaching of such inherent vitality and expansiveness than a flower pot could contain a young thriving oak. The most generally religious philosophy of our time, which finds expression in the works of Dr. Martineau, is intuitional, and a similar standpoint of the inherent *self-evidence* of all religious and moral truth is increasingly perceptible in the works of our foremost teachers both in the Church of England and among Nonconformists. Nor is this all. There is current, both here and in America, a still more expanded activity of speculation with which the primary teaching of the Quakers may claim kindred. A moment's reflection on the nature of that inner illumination and its universality will serve to show that it may have, and as an historical fact has had, affinities with Rationalism, with Mysticism, and even with Pantheism. So far, therefore, as those tendencies may be said to exist in our time, so far may neo-Quakerism be affirmed to share current sympathies and to have surroundings favourable to its energies.

Circumstances not less propitious may be found in the philanthropic and political tendencies of our day, which are quite in harmony with the noble energies in similar directions of the Quakerism of the last as well as that of the present century. Whether or not we hold that war between Christianised and civilised beings will become an impossibility, we must at least sympathise with the efforts of any religious community to promote the interests of peace. It

is impossible not to note in this relation the increasing use of arbitration as a means of settling international issues, and especially its persistent employment by Lord Salisbury and the present Government. It may be too much to suggest that the noble marquis might form the central figure of a new picture or representation—like that of Penn in West's celebrated painting—of dealing with foreign peoples by means of the pen rather than the sword; but no one would deny that the policy of the Premier is substantially that which Penn was the first to advocate and initiate in his dealings with the natives of Pennsylvania. Strenuous opposition to slavery has also, as we have noticed, been a characteristic of Quakers since the days of George Fox. How much that feeling has gathered volume and vehemence in our own day we need not stop to insist. The recent mission of Cardinal Lavigerie and the slave conference at Brussels may be said to prove the universal recognition of a humanity which two centuries ago could find no other home but in the Quaker community. Quite in harmony with the old traditions of the society, and an incidental proof of its corporate vitality, was the memorial which the society recently forwarded to Lord Salisbury on certain differences outside the main scope of the Brussels slave conference, which have hitherto prevented the general Act coming into effect.

A further point in which the auspices seem favourable to at least a sympathetic consideration of the claims of neo-Quakerism is the growing tendency to cherish simplicity and refinement as the highest characteristics of religious culture. The lofty position which Quakers have attained in the commercial, the scientific, and the political world has often been remarked, as well as the undeniable fact that the numbers of those who have attained such distinction have been unusually great in reference to the sum total of the sect; but it has not been so universally noticed that these distinctions have been acquired, not by ambitious and ostentatious self-seeking, but by the silent, unobtrusive manifestations of lives directed by simplicity and integrity. The late John Bright once spoke on a memorable occasion on this very point:—

'I am a member of a small but somewhat remarkable sect—a religious body which had a remarkable origin, and in its early days at least a somewhat remarkable history. It is of all the religious sects the one that has most taught the equality and equal rights of man. And I venture to say it is remarkable for another thing, that, probably more

than any other body, within its borders and in its service personal ambition is practically unknown.'

That there is room in the rush and fever, the bustle and rivalry of our modern existence, for a quieter, more sedate and retiring, more selfless and unambitious culture, no thoughtful and intelligent observer would, we think, wish to deny. It may be the function of neo-Quakerism not only to instil these quieter principles into its own members, but to infuse other religious bodies with the same wholesome and Christlike influences.

Miss Stephen's book seems to suggest that other influences favourable to the developement of a revived Quakerism may be found in an increasing dissatisfaction with outward forms and modes of Christian worship. We cannot at all profess to agree with her. While we grant that liturgical forms are, no more than other human and terrestrial blessings, free from imperfection, yet they are absolutely necessary for the devout expression of any large religious body as a whole. There must always be in the Church of England or any large religious community a minority to whom the forms, or the special characteristics and contents of those forms, may appear inadequate; but we must remember that no church can afford to defer to the occasional and incidental idiosyncrasies of a few of its members, no matter how high their special religious culture might happen to be. We are far, on the other hand, from wishing to criticise or find fault with the characteristic mode of Quaker worship as set forth in Miss Stephen's work. We do not dream of contending that the method of silently waiting on God for inspiration is repugnant to Christianity or to a thoughtful religious culture. The devout soul in this process may be likened to a sensitised plate set in proper position under a starlit sky, which, after due exposure, is found marked by new stars invisible to the naked eye, and beyond the farthest sweep of the unaided telescope. All we insist on is that the conditions of this silent service, the individuals adapted from idiosyncrasy and training to take part in it, must, from the nature of the case, be extremely rare.

But granting that the doctrines and usages once peculiar to Quakers are now the common possession of almost every variety of English Christianity, the question still remains, and it is one which we know is exercising the minds of the foremost members of the society, How far will this wider extension of doctrine and usage affect the existence of the Quaker body as an independent and corporate whole? We

grant that in this particular there is a danger which Quakers may be trusted to meet with the selflessness and prudence which have hitherto characterised them in similar contingencies. They might take up the poet's plaintive plea, and, with a technical appropriateness he could not have foreseen, say:—

> 'Most can raise the flowers now,
> For all have got *the seed*.'

For those who have, what all Quakers do not share, a horror of being absorbed by other religious communities, we may suggest that the only way of preserving their separate existence in the event of its being threatened is to keep unobtrusively to the main doctrines and modes of worship which have always characterised the sect. To alter those in any direction or for any reason would be merely inviting the inevitable doom of extinction. With respect to future difficulties in the way of a freer biblical criticism, which some Quakers regard with apprehension, they are only placed in the same position as other Christian churches. Indeed, the Friends have an advantage over other bodies of Christians in a creed which has always refused to dogmatise on the question of inspiration or the verbal veracity of every single text in the Bible.

Lastly. That there is room in our diversified religious culture for the continued existence, nay, even for the developement of a religious body like the Quakers, few thoughtful and devoutly disposed persons would deny. In other words, there is room for a somewhat stronger stress on spiritual idealism, the universal community of the Divine reason, than most churches are inclined to place; there is room, notwithstanding the zeal with which all Christian churches now pursue the path of philanthropy which Quakers were the first to point out to them, still ample room, for the prudent extension of their common efforts. There is room in particular cases for a greater amount of spiritual freedom. There is even room, in the case of certain choice and introspective spirits, for a worship which is content with waiting in reverential silence upon God—for those meetings of silent meditation which it is said John Bright so much enjoyed. Though we dare not predict, at least from the auspices now at our disposal, a great developement of Quakerism on purely Quaker lines, we think it would be nothing less than a misfortune for our religious culture that the school of religious discipline and devotion in which were

trained such noble and disinterested spirits as William E. Forster, John Bright, Joseph Pease (the elder), Joseph Sturge, and Samuel Bowly should cease to exist—that the calm silent contemplation of Divine things, the devout concentrated introspection which formed such noble types of steadfast self-sustained individualism should be a mode of worship doomed to extinction. We do not for a moment believe that, whatever progress may be possible for the Friends in the future, the society can ever include more than a minority of English men and women. The requisite insight into religious things, the extreme sensitiveness to the ebb and flow of religious emotion, the developed taste for refinement and unostentation, the acquired need of spontaneity in all religious services and acts of devotion, are qualities much too rare and hardly attained to allow Quakerism to become a strongly popular movement. The kind of mental idiosyncrasy, of carefully cultivated thought and feeling needed for a sympathetic recognition of Quakerism may be seen in Miss Stephen's book; and if our readers will refer to it they will find it to bear out the sense of our remarks that the 'strongholds' she indicates are, in military phraseology, 'too far removed from 'the base of operations' to become tenanted by the regular army of English religionists. They must always remain in the hands of a chosen advanced guard. But within its own sphere, and with the limitations indicated, we think English Quakerism has still a future; and if that future be animated, as it is likely to be, by the principles and motive influences that have governed its past, we may forecast for it an enduring vitality as well as a fame of which every Englishman, whether Quaker or not, may well be proud.

ART. IX.—1. *Canada and the Canadian Question.* By GOLDWIN SMITH, D.C.L. London and New York: 1891.

2. *The Expansion of England*: Two Courses of Lectures. By J. R. SEELEY, M.A. London and New York: 1888.

3. *An Essay on the Government of Dependencies.* By GEORGE CORNEWALL LEWIS, Esq. London: 1841.

WITHIN the last few months events have come to pass which serve to mark in different fashions the altered relations that are growing up between Great Britain and her self-governing colonies. The colonies of Australia have met together to take the steps necessary to constitute themselves a federation; and the Legislature of Newfoundland has appeared by its delegates at the Bar of the House of Lords to protest against legislation which the Imperial Government deemed necessary to enable it to perform its treaty obligations with a foreign power. The action of Australia directs men's attention to the relations *inter se* of the self-governing portions of the Empire; the action of Newfoundland illustrates once more the difficulty of the Imperial Government in answering to a foreign power for the action of colonies over which it has, as a matter of fact, almost entirely lost the control.

In our remarks upon the relations now existing between Great Britain and those colonies which enjoy complete representative institutions, we would ask our readers to consider the facts of the case, and to avoid the mistake of attaching too literal a meaning to the phrases and constitutional fictions which had their birth in a state of things that has now passed away. There are two opposite currents of opinion prevailing at the present day on this great subject; and they will in all probability at some future time come sharply into conflict. Each regards the present condition of the British Empire as transitional; but whilst the one believes that an ultimate solution will be found in the consolidation of the Queen's dominions under a single supreme Government, possessing authority and ability to govern and to direct the whole as a single nation, the other believes it is the destiny of Great Britain to be the 'Mother of Free Nations,' in cordial alliance and friendly intercourse with which she will pursue her career without any diminution in her actual power or her true glory. Imperial Federation is the ideal of the one school. Friendly alliance between Great Britain and those great English communities beyond the seas, now

called dependencies, but soon to be independent States, is the ideal of the other. The different temperaments and prejudices of men lead them to incline to the one view or the other; but, for our part, we believe that as time goes on facts will prove too strong for sentiment, and that, without any great wrench to our constitution, due recognition will ultimately be given to existing conditions—that virtual independence will have to be recognised as such, and that the relations between Great Britain and Australia and Canada will be determined by contract or treaty freely entered into between them, just as now are the relations between Great Britain and foreign nations.

These two views of the ultimate destiny of the Empire rest upon fundamentally different conceptions of the problem which we have to solve. The expectation of what is to come depends upon the view taken of what now exists. We may be sure that any great constitutional changes which are before us will consist in making our constitutional theory and system conform to existing facts. If the real tendency of the age is towards the identification in supreme national interest of the separate interests of British, of Australians, of Canadians, and of South Africans; if as a result of the changes that have come over the world from increased facility of locomotion and of communication, time and distance have been, as the newspapers so often tell us, virtually annihilated; if a supreme council sitting at Westminster would find as regards Imperial affairs the same unhesitating obedience in Tasmania, in Newfoundland, in Vancouver and New Zealand, which the Executive Government of the kingdom now finds in Yorkshire or in Kent, then, doubtless, the Federationist is pleading in favour of a cause which is already more than half won. Professor Seeley in his most interesting work on the 'Expansion of England' tells us that British colonisation differs from the colonisation of the ancient Greeks and the modern Germans, inasmuch as it involves not merely the enlargement of the English nationality, but also the enlargement of the English State. The fact that a Greek nationality was spread over Sicily, South Italy, and the western coast of Asia Minor, gave no new strength to the State whence it had come. 'It did 'not in any way help the Greek name when it was attacked 'and conquered from Macedonia.' So, with regard to the constant stream of emigration from Germany to America, we see—

'no "Greater Germany" coming into existence, because these emigrants,

though they carry with them, and may perhaps not altogether lose their language and their ideas, do not carry with them their State. . . . Greater Britain is a real enlargement of the English State; it carries across the seas not merely the English race but the authority of the English Government. We call it, for want of a better word, an empire; and it does resemble the great empires of history in this respect, that it is an aggregate of provinces, each of which has a Government sent out to it from the political headquarters, which is a kind of delegation from the supreme Government.'*

He thinks that Englishmen have hardly yet fully recognised the change that has come over their nation. 'We 'seem, as it were,' he writes, 'to have conquered and 'peopled half the world in a fit of absence of mind. . . . We 'have hardly yet ceased to think of ourselves as simply 'a race inhabiting an island off the northern coast of the 'continent of Europe.' There are even now ten million of Englishmen and more who live outside the narrow confines of the United Kingdom. As time goes on those outside may be expected to equal and then to exceed in number those who remain behind. Those abroad, not less than those at home, are Englishmen, and constitute a portion of the English nation. They have crossed the ocean, it is true; but 'cœlum non animum mutant qui trans mare 'currunt.'

No one can help admiring the enthusiasm and largely sympathising with the dreams of the philosophic historian. Nevertheless, truth compels us to ask in what way and by what means is the authority of the English State carried to our greater colonies? What is the delegated government which the supreme Government sends out from home to rule the British dependencies across the seas? Before turning our attention, however, to the nature of the authority actually wielded in the greater colonies by our nineteenth century proconsuls, it is desirable to consider for a moment the entirely changed views of the relations between mother country and colonies to which the establishment of self-government in our larger dependencies has given rise.

It is fifty years since the late Sir George Cornewall Lewis published his treatise on the 'Government of Dependencies.' He deals, however, with fundamental considerations, many of which have as much weight now as they had then, and he proceeds with absolute impartiality to estimate the

* 'Expansion of England,' page 42.

advantages and disadvantages accruing to the two parties from the relation between the colony and the parent State. It is involved in the very meaning of the term 'dependency' that it is not directly subject to the supreme government of the State. In the dependency there exists of necessity a government subordinate to that at home; and it is through the intervention of this subordinate government that the dependency is governed. If Canada were to send representatives to the House of Commons; if the British Parliament were to legislate directly for Canada; if the Executive Government at Westminster were to govern Canada as directly as it governs England, Canada would cease to be a dependency, and would, as far as its constitution is concerned, become an integral portion of the kingdom. Thus it is the essential characteristic of every dependency to be ruled by a government subordinate to the supreme Government at home. In our great English dependencies these local governments have been established in supposed imitation of the British Constitution, with its King, Lords, and Commons. There were, however, no materials available in the colonies for the construction of a system which would prove itself in its working a reproduction of the one it was hoped to copy. The British colonies are, in fact, democratic republics, and their governments differ from the Republican Government of the United States in that their executives are for the most part much more immediately subject to direct popular control. With Sir George Lewis, as we presume with most people, an independent dependency is a contradiction in terms. What, then, are the advantages and disadvantages supposed to accrue to the dominant country, and to the subordinate dependency, from the relation existing between them? England has never, after the fashion of the colonising States of antiquity, attempted to draw a direct revenue from her colonies. Only in one fatal instance has she attempted to raise money from them to meet the general expenses of the Empire. In the infancy of the North American colonies no attempt was made to tax them, perhaps because originally they were not worth taxing. When they became flourishing communities they were required by the supreme Government to contribute to its expenses. But then, as Sir George Lewis pithily puts it, 'it was found that whilst they had 'acquired the means of payment, they had also acquired the 'power and disposition to resist.' In 1841 he considered that the colonies of European States, with the exception

of certain military and naval stations, were rather disadvantageous than otherwise to the military strength of the latter; for they increased the burden of defence without materially sharing the burden. It is, however, in trading advantages that he thinks real benefit may come to the parent State. Sir George Lewis was, of course, a free trader, and he held that 'the dominant country, 'by securing to itself an unrestricted trade with its 'dependencies, can prevent them from establishing the 'protecting and prohibitory duties which, if they were 'independent States, they would probably impose upon 'imports.' This advantage was not one which he expected to endure; for he did not doubt that the 'perverse folly' of independent States in imposing protecting and prohibitory duties on one another's productions would soon give place to more enlightened ideas. The dominant country possesses patronage to public offices; often a convenience to the supreme Government, though sometimes of doubtful benefit to the colony. In its territory beyond the seas it finds a convenient means of ridding itself by transportation of its convicted felons. The colonies, lastly, form a place of overflow for the surplus population, and for the investment of the capital of the parent State. On the other hand, the advantages derived by the colony consist in its defence by the dominant country, and the pecuniary assistance which the British Parliament may vote for colonial purposes.

How many of these advantages on the one side and the other enumerated in 1841 can be said to be incidental to the relations existing between Great Britain and its self-governing colonies in 1891? Patronage is gone, transportation is gone, free trade with the colonies is gone, the voting of money by the British Parliament for purely colonial purposes is gone. Our surplus population flows more freely to the United States than to our own dependencies. British capital seeks investment all over the world; nor have the colonies, because they are colonies, a prior claim on the consideration of the money market. There remains defence. The colonies are entitled to be protected by the whole power of the Empire in case of foreign war; their citizens enjoy all the privileges of British subjects at home. It is by means of this protection that they have been enabled to exist, and to thrive; but whether, in the present condition of the world, this protection is as beneficial to the colonies as in former times may well be questioned. If

their condition of dependencies entitles them to defence, it undoubtedly makes them much more liable to the risk of war. Great Britain must remain essentially, notwithstanding its colonies, a European power, with gigantic interests to defend in Asia. Hence it has causes of quarrel peculiar to itself; and it is extremely improbable that in any future rupture of our relations with another European nation the quarrel will turn upon a matter which of itself has any bearing whatever upon the interests of our British and Colonial Empire taken as a whole. We may become engaged in a purely European difficulty, or in a controversy relating to the North-West Frontier of India, to fishing rights in Behring Straits or the coast of Newfoundland. We may quarrel with China as to Chinese immigration into Australia, and so forth. In each case there will, no doubt, be strong local feeling, either in Great Britain itself, or in that part of the Empire where the subject of dispute is of importance. Elsewhere there will be indifference, and men will calmly balance their loss or gain in becoming involved in war on a subject of quarrel which is not their own. The result of the careful reasoning of Sir George Lewis may be read in the following paragraph of his concluding chapter:—

'If a dominant country understood the true nature of the advantages arising from the supremacy and dependence of the related communities, it would voluntarily recognise the legal independence of such of its own dependencies as were fit for independence; it would, by its political arrangements, study to prepare for independence those which were still unable to stand alone; and it would seek to promote colonisation for the purpose of extending its trade rather than its empire, and without intending to maintain the dependence of its colonies beyond the time when they need its protection.'

With the experience of another half-century to assist his judgement, we find Mr. Goldwin Smith, in his recently published work on 'Canada and the Canadian Question,' holding substantially the same language. But before turning our attention to Mr. Smith's views and hopes as to the future relations between the British North American colonies and the United States, a few words must be said upon the real nature of the relation now existing between the supreme Government and the local Governments of our larger colonies.

The Imperial Parliament is in theory absolutely supreme. It can constitutionally legislate for Canada and for Australia, with regard to matters entirely local no less than with regard to matters of general importance to the Empire. It

can repeal any colonial statute. It can amend, or for that matter it can repeal, the very statutes to which the colonial constitutions owe their legal validity. There is known to the British Constitution no higher authority than an Act of Parliament. What Parliament has done Parliament can undo; and no lawyer doubts that Parliament is as fully competent legally to extinguish popular government in Australia as it is to repeal the Irish or the Scottish Union. One statute, of course, differs from another in importance, but all statutes are of equal validity; and the Imperial Parliament for the time being is in no respect fettered by the most fundamental Acts which preceding Parliaments have passed. Nevertheless, every educated man knows that the constitutional theory—the legal conception of the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament—is worth almost nothing in the face of the admitted fact that were the Imperial Parliament to legislate on the local affairs of Canada or Australia in a manner persistently opposed to the local 'subordinate' Governments of those countries, the sovereignty of the Imperial Parliament and of the 'dominant' country would be at once repudiated, and the colonial Governments and people would declare and establish their independence. The supreme Government exercises, however, or is supposed to exercise, a certain control over these subordinate Governments through the Governor, who is sent out to the colony by the Queen's advisers at home, and through the exercise by the Secretary of State for the Colonies of his right to veto colonial Acts of Parliament. Again, let us distinguish between constitutional theory and actual fact. In theory the Colonial Governor is the head of the colonial executive. In fact the colonial executive is entirely subordinate to and controlled by the local legislature or its nominees. If Imperial law requires to be put in force, the Governor can do no more than invite the colonial Ministry to enforce it. In all probability he will not take upon himself even as much as this. It is the Prime Minister who is in fact the head of the colonial executive: the Governor must act upon his advice. In New South Wales, not long ago, the Ministry prevented the landing in their colony of Chinese immigrants, legally entitled, as it was afterwards held in the Supreme Court of the colony, to land. When challenged in the Assembly of New South Wales with having broken the law, Sir Henry Parkes, the Prime Minister, declared that 'he cared nothing about the 'cobwebs of technical law; he was obeying a law far supe-'rior to that under which these Chinamen claimed their

'rights—namely, the law of the preservation of society in 'New South Wales.' Under these circumstances it was of course easy for Ministers to get an Act of Indemnity from the local legislature, and by no means difficult to secure the support of the British Governor, and his active intervention with the Colonial Office. As a matter of fact, the will of the colony was supreme. The local Government might act illegally, but whilst it received the support of the local legislature there was no authority capable of restraining it. Virtually the colony acted in these matters exactly as if it were an independent State entirely free from the treaty obligations which bind the British Empire. It is very possible that the Chinese may have been unfairly treated. On the other hand, it cannot be doubted that any English population under the same circumstances would act under the pressure of the same sentiments as those which influenced Sir Henry Parkes and New South Wales, and would absolutely refuse to allow the Chinese to 'denation-'alise' Australasia notwithstanding any number of treaties between China and Great Britain. We are not concerned here with the rights or the merits of the controversy, and we only refer to this incident at all in order to show where the real power lies. The colonies do not intend to admit the Chinese, and Sir Henry Parkes gave accurate expression to Australian feeling when he declared 'that neither for her 'Majesty's ships of war, nor for her Majesty's representative 'on the spot, nor for her Majesty's Secretary of State for 'the Colonies do we intend to turn aside from our purpose.' This settled the question of Chinese immigration to Australia. The Prime Minister of the sovereign of the British Empire, must give way to the Prime Minister of an Australian dependency, muttering perhaps to himself, as he yields, the words of King James to Johnnie Armstrong:—

> 'What wants this knave that a king should have?
> But the sword of honour and the crown.'

Assuredly no European sovereign could have spoken more plainly, and probably any European sovereign would have spoken more politely.*

Yet the Government of the Queen is expected to make treaties with foreign nations in the special interest of the remotest colonies, and the burden of enforcing them is practically thrown entirely upon the people of the United

* See Bluebook, July 1888, 'Chinese Immigration to Australia;' and 'Problems of Greater Britain,' vol. ii.

Kingdom. When it is contended by Australians, themselves the possessors of what were originally convict settlements, that the French nation is no longer to be allowed to transport criminals to their own island of New Caledonia, distant some 600 or 700 miles from the nearest port of the Australian coasts, it is the British Government that must extort consent from the Government of France. If the Australians 'off their own bat' annex half New Guinea, the mother country is denounced by indignant colonists for its hesitation in ratifying the annexation. Each of the larger British colonies considers its own special interest, or the prevailing sentiment of the moment, to be the highest, nay, almost the sole, concern of the British Empire. It is, of course, natural that this should be so. Yet a system cannot endure for ever under which the colonies claim the advantage of the mother country's relations with foreign powers whenever it suits them, and repudiate the burdens which those relations oppose. In the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada, two years ago, it was proposed that the right of negotiating and treating with foreign powers should belong to the Dominion. Mr. Goldwin Smith says with absolute truth that

'Canada has already gone a long way towards the attainment of diplomatic independence in regard to commercial policy. She is allowed to negotiate commercial treaties for herself under the auspices of the British Foreign Office, and subject to Imperial treaty obligations. In the everlasting imbroglio about the fisheries, her Government has a voice which it naturally uses in the way dictated by its own interests, political as well as commercial.'*

The proposal to have a Canadian representative, practically a Canadian ambassador, at Washington was defeated by the Government majority.

Before dealing with the commercial relations of our colonies with ourselves and with foreign nations, it may be as well to point out that slight as is the link between mother country and colony, arising from the presence of a British Governor in the latter, that link is in a fair way of becoming weaker still. Already the Governor of a self-governed colony has become little more than a figurehead. His position is entirely unlike that of the Governor of an American State, or that of the President of the United States. In these latter cases the Governor is *in fact* the head of the State, one of the branches of the legislature,

* 'Canada and the Canadian Question,' page 187.

drawing his authority from sources independent of their will. The British Colonial Governor is a kind of local counterpart of the British sovereign. Our monarchical system it was, of course, impossible to transplant with lasting success to countries where the surrounding conditions have necessitated the flourishing growth of democratic republics. If the policy of Australasian federation is carried out with success, as is without doubt the earnest wish of British subjects at home, there will remain but one single representative in Australasia of British authority—viz. the Governor-General for the whole of the Australasian colonies, for the Lieutenant-Governors of the different States of the Confederation will have no relations whatever with the home country, but will either be the representatives in each State of the Federation Government, as in Canada, or be the real heads of the executive and constituent parts of the State legislature, as in the United States. The Government of Queensland three years ago expressed a desire—and we do not know that it was an unnatural one—to have a voice in the appointment of its own Governor. The outbreak of feeling in that colony against Sir Henry Blake when nominated to the Governorship by the Crown, unreasonable, doubtless, to the last degree though that feeling was, prevailed with the Colonial Office, and another appointment was made in deference to colonial opinion; and surely no one can expect that the present system, under which the colony provides for and maintains the Governorship, whilst the Governor is the nominee of the Crown on the advice alone of the Secretary of State, is one of lasting duration. We have, it seems, to contemplate a near future when British sovereignty over the whole of British North America and over the whole of Australasia will be represented in the persons of two gentlemen, one in Canada and the other in Australia, persons doubtless of some dignity, but possessed of no real power, and who owe their appointments very largely to the circumstances of political parties at home. The fact is, that the connexion between Great Britain and its colonies has already for a great number of purposes almost ceased to be a political connexion. We do not see how it is possible to gainsay Mr. Goldwin Smith when he declares that

'of dominion over the colony barely a rag remains to the mother country, and even that remnant is grudged, and is being certainly nibbled away. The appellate jurisdiction of the Privy Council has

been narrowed by the interposition of the Canadian Supreme Court; there is a smouldering agitation for the transfer of the military command from a British to a Canadian officer; and, with regard to commercial matters, there is a gradual assertion of diplomatic independence. This we have seen. The appointment of a Governor-General is about all that remains; and it may, perhaps, not be long before the colonies generally improve upon the example of Queensland, which asserted a veto, and, under some constitutional form of recommending a name to her Majesty, take the appointment to themselves.' *

Constitutional writers assert that there are five very important links which bind together *all* the outlying portions of our Empire.

They enumerate them as follows:—(1) The indisputable omnipotence of Parliament over the whole Empire. (2) The power of the Home Government to disallow any law passed by a colonial legislature. (3) The appointment of Governors by the Home Government. (4) The power of the Home Government and Parliament to decide upon questions of peace and war for the whole Empire. (5) The appeal from colonial courts of law to the Privy Council.† Of these it may be said with indisputable truth that, as regards (1) and (2), the authority of the Home Government and Parliament is practically incapable of being exercised if in opposition to the strong desires of any important self-governed colony. As regards (3), we have seen that the course of events is certain rapidly to diminish the numbers, as it is already rapidly diminishing the importance, of these supposed representatives of Imperial authority. Every year they are becoming more entirely dependent upon—perhaps we should say subordinate to—the authority of the local ministry and legislature. As regards (4), it is strongly urged by Mr. Goldwin Smith that the exercise of the prerogative as to the peace and war of the Empire, resting as it undoubtedly does with the Home Ministry and Parliament, is not likely to prove conducive to the real interests either of Great Britain or her great colonies.

'The strength of England is, and always has been, in herself, and not in her dependencies. Alone she fought and vanquished Louis XIV. and Napoleon, as well as Philip II. Some Sepoys sent to Egypt in the war with France, some Sepoys brought to the Mediterranean fourteen years ago as a demonstration against Russia, the regiment raised by Australia for the campaign in the Soudan—these are about the total

* Page 243.

† See 'Colonial Constitution of the British Empire,' by Sir E. Creasy.

amount of military contribution ever drawn by the Imperial country from what is called the Empire. Black regiments were raised in the West Indies, and the 100th Regiment was originally raised in Canada, but at the Imperial expense. On the other hand, one dependency at least has drawn heavily on Imperial resources in an hour of extreme peril. When Wellington faced Napoleon at Waterloo, he must, as he looked on the raw levies or foreign auxiliaries around him, have thought with bitterness of his victorious veterans, who were on the wrong side of the Atlantic, engaged in what, as the conquest of Canada was the American aim, was really a colonial war. Had Canada then been in the American Union, her friendly vote might have turned the scale of its councils generally in favour of England. The British in the United States have hitherto, to a great extent, declined naturalisation, repelled, perhaps, by the political feeling against their native country. But they have now been persuaded to take the wiser course, and are being naturalised in great numbers. As soon as this vote makes itself felt, the influence of the Irish vote and of the enemies of England on politics will decrease. The Nova Scotian vote is said to have told the other day in Massachusetts. No other kind of aid will it be in Canada's power to lend. If this assertion is questioned, let the Canadian Government be called upon while yet it is time to say plainly what assistance, military or naval, it is able to afford, and in what contingency the assistance will be afforded.'

He goes on to quote with approval a letter written by Sir Henry Taylor in 1852, when Under Secretary for the Colonies, to Lord Grey, in which the former declares that though he certainly does not consider the Northern American provinces useless to the mother country, 'he regards any 'present uses not obtainable from them as independent 'nations as no more than the dust in the balance compared 'with the evil contingencies.' Mr. Goldwin Smith, however, is looking not to the independence of Canada so much as to its absorption by its powerful neighbour, as to which we shall have a few words to say later on. On the side of Canada he asks what gain is there in the fact that for war or for peace she is bound to follow the decisions come to by English statesmen? If Canada receives military or naval protection, 'it is protection of a very precarious kind. It is 'not pretended that the arm of England would save Canada 'from invasion: the most that is alleged is that when 'Canada had suffered all the evils of invasion she would be 'redeemed by the pressure which the English navy would 'put upon the seaboard cities of the enemy;' and it is barely probable that the protection rendered by our navy would be sufficient to prevent the ruinous reduction of Canadian trade. It is contended that English protection saves Canada military, naval, and diplomatic expenditure.

'In the balance,' he continues, 'against this claim to protection and this saving of expense, must be laid the heavy weight of a constant liability to entanglements in the quarrels of England all over the world, with which Canada has nothing to do, and about which nothing is known by her people. Her commerce may any day be cut up, and want brought into her homes, by a war about the frontier of Afghanistan, about the treatment of Armenia or Crete by the Turks, about the relations of the Danubian Principalities to Russia, or about the balance of power in Europe. No one in Canada who forms his estimate of public sentiment through his senses, and not through his fancy, can doubt what the result would be.'

Moreover, there is much grumbling amongst Canadians, on the ground that their interests are constantly sacrificed by British diplomacy to Imperial exigencies.

On political and on commercial grounds, in the interest of Great Britain and in the interest of Canada, Mr. Goldwin Smith boldly contends that the annexation of Canada by the United States is to be desired. 'Annexation is an ugly 'word; it seems to convey the idea of force or pressure 'applied to the smaller State, not of free, equal, and honour-'able union like that between England and Scotland.'

But surely Mr. Goldwin Smith, in advocating the entrance of the Canadian Dominion into the national system of the United States, is arguing against himself. It is for independence that he was pleading, when he told us (at p. 247) 'that the disadvantages of dependence stare us in the face. 'If to be a nation is strength, energy, and grandeur, to be 'less than a nation is to have less than a full measure of 'all these. . . . The dependency shares, it may be replied, 'the greatness of the Imperial nation. It does, but only as 'a dependent; it bears the train, not wears the royal robe.' Why the inhabitants of the Canadian Dominion should acquire increased dignity and self-respect by becoming broken up into several States, each subordinate to the supreme Government of the United States, we entirely fail to perceive. On the contrary, the position of the Canadian Dominion at the present moment seems to approach much more nearly to that of independent nationhood than it would do were Canada received into the system of the United States. The change would, in fact, be away from complete independent nationhood, not towards it. It is very conceivable that if we regard for a moment the natural aspirations of the Canadians, we may find a certain amount of dissatisfaction with the limitations (necessitated by the colonial connexion) to their national character, a longing

to assume for themselves the full and sole responsibility for their own national career. But, so far as sentiment is concerned, if this completeness of Canadian nationality is to be denied them, we can hardly understand how sentiment can impel the Canadian to exchange the character of British subject for that of American citizen. As regards the material interests of the Canadian, Mr. Goldwin Smith has perhaps stronger arguments to press. Even there, however, we are inclined to think that he overstates the identity of commercial interest between the vast territories north of the Canadian frontier and the lands to the south.

Whilst we cannot agree with Mr. Goldwin Smith that either the sentiment of Canadian patriotism or the strong hope of the future destiny of Canada ought to incline the ordinary Canadian to merge the various provinces of the Dominion in the system of the United States, we concur with him fully in deprecating the mischief done by the maintenance of that great barrier on commerce and trade which the protectionist prejudices both of the United States and of Canada seem determined to maintain. We see no reason, however, for preferring commercial union with the United States as an ultimate remedy for Canadian fiscal grievances, to the higher ideal of free trade. It would, indeed, be to build up a nation upon a temporary exigency were Canada and the United States to base their union upon a tariff war against the rest of the world.

'The continent,' says Mr. Goldwin Smith, 'is an economic whole, and to run a customs line athwart it and try to sever its members from each other is to wage a desperate war against nature.'

It is perfectly true that the natural market for the vast proportion of Canadian produce lies to the South.

'The maritime provinces want to send their lumber, their bituminous coal, and their fish to the markets of New England; Ontario and Quebec want to send their barley, eggs, and other farm produce, their horses, their cattle, and their lumber to New York and other neighbouring States; Manitoba and the North-West want to send their superior wheat, their barley, their wool, and the fish of their great lakes to St. Paul and Mineapolis. British Columbia wants to send her bituminous coal, her salmon, and the timber of which she is the mighty mother to California and Oregon. All of them want to get American manufactures, as well as the products of a more southern climate in return.'

The 'tariff wall' may be, as Mr. Goldwin Smith says, a positive 'curse' to Manitoba and the North-West, but can it not be levelled without building another against the trade

of the transmarine world? We cannot grant that because nations are separated by wide oceans it is in accordance with some law of nature that they should hamper each other's trade. Neither can we agree with Mr. Goldwin Smith that, in any sense yet given to the expression, the continent of North America constitutes an 'economic whole.'

We find every difference in the North American continent, and more than every difference, whether of climate or of natural production, which separates and has always separated from each other the nations of Europe. What community is there of commercial interest between the dwellers on the Gulf of Mexico and the fur traders of the North-West? Common blood, common religion, common language prevail for the most part throughout the continent of North America. Commercial interests may in some sense be common also, but it is only in the sense in which the commercial interests of the whole world are common. We found that Sir George Cornewall Lewis in 1851 considered that the advantages accruing to mother country and colony from the free trade existing between them would not long form a special advantage of the colonial relationship. Independent nations would equally see that between them also there was a community of interest in the free exchange of their goods. Mr. Goldwin Smith would, in 1891, knit together a nation by ties which Sir George Lewis fifty years ago saw would not suffice to give permanency even to the colonial relation.

Mr. Goldwin Smith does not appeal to national sentiment except as against Great Britain. As against the connexion with Great Britain he argues in favour of Canadian nationality.

In arguing in favour of the annexation of Canada by the United States he seems to forget Canadian nationality altogether. Yet this would be absolutely extinguished. She would number at most one tenth of the population of the Union, and it is by no means certain that even her commercial interests would be safe in the long run from attack by the very different interests which prevail in other parts of the vast North American continent. Neither from the commercial nor from the sentimental standpoint, therefore, is a strong case proved for annexation. Though Mr. Smith is an out-and-out free-trader, and though he observes the various signs which indicate that the Americans are themselves beginning to see the mischief of protection, yet his chief commercial argument for annexation is the continuance of the predominance of the protectionist policy throughout

North America. Were the world to embrace free trade, as Sir George Lewis expected, this argument would disappear. Canada, whilst still preserving its integrity and nationality, would trade across the frontier as freely as New York trades with Pennsylvania, and it would trade freely with the rest of the world as well. That, commercially speaking, is the true ideal—Canada, endowed with the blessings of free commerce, not merely in the North American continent, but throughout the world. It may be, indeed it must be, that the present commercial policy of the United States and the present commercial policy of Canada inflict great injuries upon the trade of both, and that with regard to both the interests of the many are being sacrificed to those of well-organised and strongly interested minorities. The question is not as to the grievance, but as to the remedy; and we believe the best remedy is to be found in breaking down the domination of protection, not by throwing the Canadians into the arms of a protectionist nation. Let our ideal be a free-trade world rather than a free-trade America. If that ideal is attainable, what commercial argument remains for annexation? It is Mr. Smith himself who tells us that—

'New England is now praying for free admission of raw materials. The Republican party in the United States is the war party kept on foot for the sake of maintaining the war tariff in the interest of the protected manufacturers. It has made a desperate effort to retain power and to rivet its policy on the nation by means which have estranged from it the best of its supporters; but in the late elections it has received a signal and probably decisive overthrow. What all the preachings of economic science were powerless to effect has been brought about at last by the reduction of the public debt, and of the necessity for duties as revenue. A new commercial era has apparently dawned for the United States, and the lead of the United States will be followed in time by the rest of the world' (p. 299).

The Imperial Federation League, whose president is Lord Rosebery, declares that 'in order to secure the per-'manent unity of the Empire, some form of federation is 'essential.' Only last month the League gave fresh evidence of its vitality. It sent a deputation to the Prime Minister and it gave a dinner to itself. Lord Salisbury was asked to summon at an early date 'a conference of the self-governing 'countries of the Empire to consider the question of securing 'to them a real and effective share in the privileges and 'responsibilities of a united Empire under conditions which 'are consistent with the present political constitution of the 'United Kingdom and with the self-government possessed

'by the colonies.' The Prime Minister, in a speech which apparently gave much satisfaction to the League, suggested that the time had now arrived when the League would do well to take another step forward and propound a scheme, for without actual schemes to consider 'we should not get 'very far. You have stated to us a problem, I might 'almost call it an enigma.' To solve it would require much time and the labour of many active brains. The Prime Minister is, of course, aware that in order to federate the British Empire it is inevitable that a mighty change must be made in the constitution of the United Kingdom; and he mentions two objects of desire, without which it would be useless to found a federated Empire, viz. a Zollverein and a Kriegsverein—a union with respect to a customs policy and a union for war. The Imperial Federationist must be blind indeed if he supposes that the British Empire will act as a single nation either to promote a customs union or to provide out of common resources a military and naval force which is to be at the disposal of the new Federal Government. What the colonies, or Canada at all events, understand by the commercial union of the British Empire, is a return to the old policy of giving the colonies a preferential right to British markets: it means free trade within the British Empire, and protection as against the rest of the world. This is a policy which no British statesman will support, and which would be diametrically opposed to the interests of the United Kingdom.

'The trade both of exports and imports of England with the colonies was in 1889, 187,000,000*l.*; her total trade in the same year with foreign countries was 554,000,000*l.* Is it likely that she will sacrifice a trade of 554,000,000*l.* sterling to a trade of 187,000,000*l.* sterling? The framers of an Imperial Zollverein, moreover, would have some lively work in reconciling the tendencies of strong protectionist colonies, such as Victoria and Canada, with the free-trade tendencies of Great Britain and New South Wales' (p. 291).

For the present it is perfectly clear that it is quite impossible to establish free trade throughout the Empire. Our so-called dependencies, like all new countries, raise their revenue largely out of customs. Direct taxation is unpopular. The colonies claim the right, and exercise it, of taxing British commerce. We quote Sir Charles Dilke, whom Mr. Goldwin Smith considers a strong Imperialist, to the same effect:—

'The crux of imperial federation,' says Sir Charles, 'lies in this tariff question. The British Empire for customs purposes consists of

a great number of foreign and almost hostile countries, and it is as difficult to conceive the whole of the colonies becoming free-trade communities as to expect the mother country to become protectionist under such temptation as the Canadians could hold out to her. We have not as yet been able to reduce to harmony, or to found upon a base of principle, the tariffs even of those Crown colonies in which we are all-powerful, and there seems indeed but little hope of the adoption of a common system for the Empire as a whole. In declaring that a Zollverein is by no means a practical proposal towards the consolidation of the Empire, Lord Rosebery no doubt thinks that any commercial union tempting the mother country into the paths of protection is impossible, just because colonial protectionists are more anxious to keep out the goods of Great Britain and of India than those of any other portion of the world; but he perhaps also feels that, were it possible of attainment, such a Zollverein would be opposed to our best hopes of the future of the world. Instead of doing our utmost to break down the barriers between peoples, we should be setting up new ones, which would help to parcel the globe into three or four great systems of the future, shut off from and hostile to one another.' *

In plain English, the suggestion of a customs union of the British Empire is a proposal which is at the present time 'outside the pale of practical politics.'

Let us turn to the Kriegsverein—the union for war—by which the whole Empire is to contribute to the general defence of the whole Empire, and to the support of an army and a navy which are to be commanded and controlled by the governing authority of the Federation. The colonies are already beginning to take part in their own local defence; but generations must pass away before they will be able to do more, i.e. before they not merely relieve the United Kingdom of a burden in war, but are capable of adding to its fighting strength against another European nation. There are, of course, certain special places which in time of war would evidently be of the greatest use as coaling stations, or as providing harbour and dock accommodation for such a naval power as that of Great Britain. But apart from this it is very difficult to discover in what direction, or by what means, the great colonies would be able to render material assistance to the mother country. With our present relations it would be vain to expect Australia and New Zealand, Canada and the Cape, to contribute regiments to our army or millions to our exchequer. Would a federation of the Empire add to its military and naval strength? We believe it would not, and for a reason

* 'Problems of Greater Britain,' vol. ii. p. 475.

which tells strongly against the practicability of establishing any real federation of the Empire—viz. that neither the United Kingdom nor the great self-governing colonies are prepared to surrender their own independence to any authority which 'the wit of man' is capable of constructing. The great colonies, we have seen, are virtually independent already; that is to say, there is no external authority capable of governing them. Would representation in London, a supreme executive, or board, or cabinet, call it what you will, of the Australian and Canadian colonies reconcile Australia to the despatch of Australian troops to defend the frontier of Canada? Would the Parliament of the United Kingdom give up its Imperial authority, and surrender its control over the Imperial forces, to an executive independent of itself? During any period which it is necessary for the present generation to contemplate, the fighting strength of the Empire will be almost synonymous with the fighting strength of the United Kingdom, i.e. it will be the British army and the British navy. Not with regard to military matters only, but with regard to the whole of the affairs of Great Britain and her colonies, internal and external, it must always be borne in mind that federated states are not themselves independent nations. They are necessarily subordinate to the federal constitution and the federal authority, and it is absolutely futile to aim at 'federation' without at the same time contemplating a certain surrender of national independence. The command of the army and the navy, the strength at which they are to be maintained, their distribution throughout the Empire, are all matters dependent upon policy. Is it part of the scheme of the Imperial Federation League that Parliament and the Ministry of its choice are not to have the last word on the foreign policy of the kingdom?

The same difficulty, though perhaps in a less marked degree, will be found to exist with regard to the civil administration of a proposed federation. Are we prepared to establish federal courts of law, with federal judges, to interpret the rights of the federal states, to maintain the authority of the Act of Federation, and to enforce the execution of the federal will?—courts which will restrain the action of the Supreme Court of Judicature at Westminster, of the Court of Session in Edinburgh, nay, even of the House of Lords, and which will have power to set aside the will of King, Lords, and Commons as being contrary to the Constitution. You cannot federate the Empire without having a written

constitution, which written constitution, again, it must necessarily be outside of the authority of a local parliament to modify. It is not only in cases of great and exceptional importance that the intervention of federal authority will take place. Throughout the whole of the United States spreads a network of federal courts, an army of federal tax gatherers, entirely independent of State authority. Will Australia, will Canada, submit to such a system? Will the United Kingdom? The Imperial Federation League has been asked by the Prime Minister to give the country some sort of suggestion of a federation scheme. And it would tend to elucidate the position of the League not a little if they would first put down in black and white what are the objects federation is to accomplish. Vague talk about interests common to the whole Empire is not sufficient. It is time that these interests were enumerated. The system of the United States need not, of course, be taken as an example; but surely the principal subjects reserved by that constitution to the Supreme Government must be intended to be reserved by our own federationists to the Federal Government of the future. These subjects are:—

War and peace, treaties and foreign relations.
Control of army and navy.
Federal courts of justice.
Commerce, foreign and domestic.

And all taxation necessary to carry out the foregoing purposes and for the general support of the Government.

If, as Professor Seeley wishes, we are to consolidate the scattered millions of British subjects of European blood in a single 'nation,' surely such matters as these must be treated as 'national.' The future it is impossible to read, but few men will seriously maintain that the time has yet come when it is possible under any constitution to treat British trade and commerce from an Imperial standpoint, or to subject the British Empire to Imperial taxation.

If we are to establish a supreme Federal Government at all, we shall only be doing mischief if it has not the power to *govern* the whole Empire. An old constitution, a system to which we have been accustomed by long experience—often works well by means of accepted fictions and general understandings, which make its actual operation very different from what was originally contemplated. With a new constitution it is not so. The system must be what it pretends to be, or it will break down. To set up a Federal Government only strong enough to weaken the Government

of the United Kingdom, but not strong enough really to lead as well as rule the Empire, would be mischievous in the last degree. And where are our materials for the construction of a Supreme Government which would speak with equal authority for the wide regions comprised in the Dominion of Canada, the Australasian colonies, and the United Kingdom? It is very common to hear criticism of the system of presidential election in the United States. Yet this presidential election has about it a character of nationalism. The supreme executive of the nation is chosen by the whole nation. Party politics run high, but they run throughout the United States as a whole. The same names are appealed to in a presidential contest on the one side and the other, from the north of Maine to the Gulf of Mexico. This creates, or at least is necessarily coexistent with, a common public opinion. Party battle cries and the names of great party leaders are household words throughout the length and breadth of the land. The people feel a common interest in public affairs, and their politics, whilst dividing them into party camps, unite them in a single nation. Democratic government prevails in the British Empire as well as in the United States; and democratic government means government by public opinion. What common public opinion is there to govern the British Empire? The names of public men who are known in Canada and Australia, the political matters in which Canadians and Australians are interested, are absolutely unknown to the electorate of the United Kingdom; there is no newspaper press common to the whole Empire, there is no common interest felt in public affairs. We are not arguing in favour of a presidential election for the British Empire. Heaven forefend! Whilst the presidential system helps to bind together the United States, it is the Crown, and the sentiment which attaches to it, which keeps alive the sense of a common nationality amongst British subjects all the world over. There is one name, a household word to us all—one toast, honoured as much in the most democratic colony of the antipodes as in the heart of the Empire. British subjects are proud of the sovereignty of the Queen. They are proud, moreover, of their old flag—sentiments the importance of which it is impossible to overestimate, but which nevertheless must not blind us to the facts with which we have to deal. It is because the sovereign does not govern that she is sovereign of the British Empire; and we wish in the present article to deal with questions of actual government. The existence

of the Crown maintains a common sentiment and feeling of kinship amongst her subjects at home and abroad. It helps to spread a common sentiment through communities which are for purposes of government in fact separate, independent republics. Towards a newly constructed supreme federal Government no sort of sentiment would attach, and yet it would be expected to govern. We believe that the Imperial Federation League, though the motives of its members are most estimable, is fundamentally mistaken in trying to establish supreme Imperial control. Control of the Empire as a whole from a single centre, and as a single nation 'amongst the nations of the earth,' we believe to be impossible. It can only prevail at the cost of local independence. To attempt to centralise Imperial authority will be to endanger, not to strengthen, the mutual friendly sentiments now existing between mother country and colonies. Let us by all means endeavour to work together in friendship towards common ends; and in order to do so let us recognise facts, and let us found our co-operation frankly on alliance between virtually independent states—not on the fiction of a common subordination to supreme control. The Imperial Federation League, with its president, Lord Rosebery, at its head, has misread the signs of the times. In aiming at unity in supreme national government for the whole Empire, it is aiming at the impossible. Man cannot unite what Heaven itself has put asunder. The interests of ourselves, and of our colonies, and of one colony and another, are diverse in very many of those matters which have generally been considered of essentially national importance. In some respects they are diametrically opposed. In such circumstances it is to a 'union of hearts,' rather than to any constitutional rearrangements, that we must look for a continuance of friendly relations. A union of hearts may perhaps afford a basis on which to build a durable alliance, though it is evidently insufficient to constitute out of separate and antagonistic communities a single nation. It is curious enough that the very men who, between Great Britain and Ireland, would rid themselves of 'a paper union,' and who put implicit trust in the friendly sentiments of Englishmen and Irishmen, cannot rest satisfied as regards Great Britain and her colonies without striving after some form of united government. In the one case, where union and where central control are essential to the very safety of the kingdom, in the different parts of which, moreover, hearts are very far from being united, almost every bond except the

sentimental one is to be discarded; whilst in the other case, where the feeling is excellent, but where the very nature of the case forbids a real system of united government, there we must clamour for a 'paper union,' though as yet the friends of Imperial union, like the friends of Irish Home Rule, are singularly shy of committing their schemes of union or of separation to paper.

We are not sure if Imperial Federationists are yet agreed as to whether the United Kingdom is to form a unit of the Federation; or whether England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales are to be treated as distinct states. We shall not here waste time in discussing the ridiculous project of federalising the United Kingdom. And we have assumed in our remarks that the United Kingdom is to remain a single state. When the people realise that the kingdom is intended to give up its separate nationality—to be but one state of a great Federation—the Federationists will have enough to do in reconciling them to the change. Mr. Goldwin Smith appears to think that we should require a 'Governor' for the kingdom, as for the other states of our united Empire:—

'The same person,' he observes, 'could not be the head at once of a federation and of one of the communities included in it, any more than the same person could be President of the United States and Governor of New York. Her Majesty would have to choose between the British and the Pan-Britannic crown' (p. 262).

In all the talk of the desirability of drawing closer the relations between Great Britain and her colonies, how seldom do we find any consciousness of the mighty change in the constitution of the kingdom, and in its position in the world, which its subordination to a new Federal authority will entail! Yet, whatever are the difficulties in the way of federation, if in truth the interests of ourselves and of all the remote parts of the Empire are common national interests, if in truth there exists a very strong desire both at home and in the colonies for a single supreme national Government, which is really to govern the whole Empire as a single great nation, some way will be found of giving expression in our constitution to the new state of things. The adaptability of our constitution to changed conditions has been proved over and over again. And doubtless we are as capable as ever of working our old constitution so as to keep pace with the ever changing necessities of the time. But *is* the real tendency towards identification of interest, and is there, either at home or in

the colonies, a strong and permanent inclination towards a federal constitution?

To our mind the tendencies of the time are in the opposite direction. Hitherto the population of our Australian colonies has, for the most part, consisted of those who have themselves emigrated from the old country. To them England was 'home.' Now the Australian-born, who do not know England at first hand, are predominant. These men are not looking eagerly—as so many emigrants used to look—for the day when the riches which they have amassed will enable them to establish a permanent home for their descendants in England. Their own future, and the future of their families, is an Australian future. England is becoming, in sentiment, to Australians less and less of a home—a country which they wish to visit, not one to which they are ever longing to return. It cannot but be so. In Queensland, at all events, according to Sir Charles Dilke, the establishment of Australian federation is a step towards Australian independence. According to Mr. Goldwin Smith, Australia is certainly not eager for Imperial federation, even if she is not actually adverse.

'In some of her cities the missionary of Imperial federation can scarcely find an audience. From Africa comes no audible response. In British Canada the movement has no apparent strength, except what it derives from an alliance with protectionism, which, as has already been said, repudiates a commercial union of the Empire and insists on maintaining its separate tariff. To the French Nationalists of Quebec anything that would bind their country closer to Great Britain is odious, and they were disposed to receive the present governor-general coldly because he was supposed to favour such a policy. In Great Britain itself the movement shows no sign of strength. For several years, under Lord Beaconsfield, Imperialism had everything its own way, yet not a step was taken towards federation. That was the grand opportunity, but federationists failed to grasp it by the forelock. Not a step has been taken to this hour beyond holding a meeting of colonists, absolutely without authority, which dined, wined, and talked about postal communications, all power of dealing with the great question having been expressly withheld. Lord Beaconsfield's successor in the Tory leadership has plainly declined to commit himself to the project. We seem to be a long way from a spontaneous and overwhelming vote, nothing short of which would suffice. The approach to centralisation at once sets all the centrifugal forces in action; it did this even in the case of American federation, so that the project narrowly escaped wreck; and miscarriage would beget, instead of closer union, discord, estrangement, and perhaps rupture. Let us bear the warning example of the American colonies in mind.

'What is the real motive for encountering all the difficulties and perils of this more than gigantic undertaking, for running laboriously counter to the recent course of colonial history, as well as to the natural tendencies of the race, and for taking the political heart and brain, as it were, out of each of those free communities and transferring them to London? We are told that the federal Empire would impose peace upon the world. This assumes that dispersion is strength, and that Great Britain would be made more formidable in war by being bound up with unmilitary communities. But suppose it true, surely the appearance of a world-wide power, grasping all the waterways and all the points of maritime advantage, instead of propagating peace, would, like an alarm gun, call the nations to battle! The way to make peace on earth is to promote the arming, not of an exclusive military league, but of the Parliament of Man, the moral Parliament of Man, at least, by enlarging the action of international law and repressing the ambitious passions to which, however philanthropic may be our professions, Imperialism really appeals. If no distinct object can be assigned, if no definite plan can be produced, if the projectors are conscious that there is no practical step upon which they can venture, surely the project ought to be frankly laid aside and no longer allowed to darken counsel, hide from us the real facts of the situation, and prevent the deliverer from advancing on the true path.'

A great many of Mr. Goldwin Smith's readers, who cannot endorse the whole of the views which they find in his recent work, undoubtedly share his opinion and that of the Prime Minister—viz. that if there is anything real in the supposed demand for Imperial Federation, it is high time that the demand should take definite shape. We know that it is of importance that good feeling should prevail throughout the Empire, that a spirit of loyalty to the Queen and flag should be the common possession of British subjects all over the world. But we have a right to look for something more than platitudes, and we confess we do not feel confident that federation has come one inch nearer to us because at some great banquet of the League colonists and Englishmen have been alike rapturous with Imperial enthusiasm in drinking the health of the Queen! The problem with which the League have to deal is one of government. They must look the facts in the face, and not content themselves, as heretofore, with the exchange of amiable speeches. Let Lord Rosebery, Lord Aberdeen, Lord Brassey, and Lord Reay sit down with other leading men of the League, Englishmen or colonists, and think the matter fairly out, and give us their suggestions in a plain, intelligible form. Sir George Bowen, who is naturally and deservedly a person of some weight amongst the leaders of the League, has put his

thoughts into a tolerably explicit form, for, in a paper on Imperial Federation, he has told us that he looks to 'the 'establishment of an Imperal Council or Federal Assembly, 'analogous to the Congress of the United States and to the 'Reichstag of United Germany.' Further, 'a successful 'federation must be not merely a federation of governments, 'but it must have a central and representative federal 'executive and legislature.'

Such a constitution for the Empire involves, as we have already seen, a fundamental reconstruction of our whole political system. Again, we say to the Imperial League: 'Think it out'! Your sentiments, we know, are excellent; don't be afraid of their being wrecked upon hard facts! In the meantime, on our part, we think we need only remark, in the cautious language of modern statesmanship, that for such a constitution as Sir G. Bowen has indicated, whether it be good or bad, desirable or the reverse, the British Empire is not yet 'ripe.' The Federationists may be in advance of the age. If so, we will look to them for future teaching, and will give, in no unfriendly spirit, the deepest consideration to any practical proposals upon a subject fraught with such tremendous consequences, for good or for evil, to the future of the Anglo-Saxon race and the whole world.

---

ART. X.—*The Melvilles, Earls of Melville, and the Leslies, Earls of Leven.* By SIR WILLIAM FRASER, K.C.B., LL.D. Three Volumes quarto. (Privately printed.) Edinburgh: 1890.

THIS is another of Sir William Fraser's handsome contributions to Scottish family history. We lately had occasion to present our readers with a sketch of his two volumes on the Hamiltons, Earls of Haddington, the story contained in which we found as interesting as a romance. Yet the materials were familiar history, and the charm consisted mainly in the historic sequence with which they followed each other. Sir William Fraser no doubt had the advantage in his last venture of being able to adopt as the hero of his work a striking political and personal figure in the founder of the family, one who held direct and influential relations with the chief actors in the stirring events of those times. Perhaps no one of the not unimportant personages who follow each other through the interesting pages of the

present work had the same distinct and vigorous personality as that of the famous 'Tam o' the Coogate;' yet among the 'Earls of Leven and Melville' we are here introduced to some men who left their mark on the history of their country, and of these we propose chiefly to speak.

The panoramic view which we obtain from these volumes takes a wide sweep. The first volume is devoted to narrative, the second and third to charters and other documents. We begin about the time of the Conquest, and we end with the days of Sir Walter Scott and Kirkpatrick Sharpe, of Zachary Macaulay and Thomas Chalmers. It leaves a weird kind of impression to find, as we do here, the names of some places with which we have been long familiar, mentioned, with little alteration, in these monkish writings of nearly a thousand years ago.

The book itself is illustrated by portraits, autographs, and facsimiles which add greatly to the vividness of the narrative. The autographs alone, embracing those of most of the crowned heads of this country and very many celebrated persons, make an unusually interesting collection. The volumes relate to the history of two distinct branches of a race of Scottish magnates, the Melvilles of Melville and the Leslies of Leven. They rose to distinction, and the two families at last were united in the earldoms respectively of Leven and Melville, the Melville barony being the earlier, while Leven became an earldom sooner than Melville did. The first *habitat* of the Melvilles was in the county of Midlothian, in regions well known to all students at the University of Edinburgh. We are given facsimiles of some of the earliest writings in relation to these possessions, and we find Roslin and Granton, and Hawthornden and Liberton, Stenhouse and Gorton among the subjects of the first of these conveyances. The earliest bears date 1160, and it is a very creditable specimen of mediæval caligraphy, as indeed title deeds of that period are generally found to be, being the performances of the cultured monks, whose ink, parchment, and handwriting are certainly superior to the pen, ink, and paper of their successors.

The origin of the name of Melville is left by Sir William Fraser in some doubt. He says that there is reason to believe that a person of the name of *Maleville* came over from France with the Conqueror, and the name itself, as we have it, seems to suggest such an origin. The substitution of *Mel* for *Mal* in the modern shape of it seems as much a corruption as the terminal *vin*, very often substituted for

*ville*, especially in the older and French documents. We should surmise that the true etymon indicated a French name for some locality used for a special occupation; the word *mail* or *mal* having various known significances incident to the possession of land, as in Pall Mall it seems to indicate a pleasure walk or terrace. *Mail*, on the other hand, which is the usual form in which we find the name of Melville written in the older time, seems to be significant of rent or feudal prestation.

Sir William Fraser has not much to tell us of the early Melvilles in Midlothian. They took root and became powerful about the time of William the Lion and the Crusades, and the early charters which are printed in these volumes run in the name of that monarch. One *Galfridus* is among the first bearers of the name and recipient of the lands. He flourished about 1170. Beyond having been Sheriff of Edinburgh Castle there is nothing remarkable to relate of him. The first charter referred to by Sir William Fraser conveys certain lands of Liberton 'as freely' as a personage called *Melbet* 'had held them.' It seems that in one of these writings the name is spelt *Macbeth*, and there is a legend that Macbeth—the historical Macbeth—was the proprietor of lands in that locality.

Considering the amount of material provided for us in the notices which follow, it is not necessary that we should dwell in detail on the fortunes of Galfridus or his descendants. But they lived and flourished for two centuries, and certainly had large possessions in Midlothian and Linlithgowshire. The male line failed in 1458, and the lands descended to the daughter of the last proprietor, one Agnes Melville, and they afterwards vested, through her right, in a family of the name of Ross, now, we are told, represented by the family of the late Earl of Glasgow.

We turn to another branch, the origin of which seems equally uncertain, but some of whose members were conversant with great events and bore conspicuous parts in some of the most troubled times of our history. Sir William Fraser says on page 23:—

'Just about the time that the direct male line of the old family of the Lords of Melville, in Midlothian, became extinct, one of the cadet branches of the house was taking root on the northern shore of the Firth of Forth, at Raith, near Kirkcaldy, in the county of Fife. In this family of Melville of Raith the name of the Melvilles was again to flourish, and to rise to nobler rank than it had formerly enjoyed.'

We must turn across the Firth of Forth, in company with

our author, and inquire into the origin and fortunes of another branch of the name. Whence came the Melvilles of Raith our author is unable to tell us; but we may as well pass on at once to the first man of any importance who appears in these volumes, viz. Sir John Melville of Raith, who flourished in 1502–1548. He seems to have been a man of considerable ability and energy and to have been engaged in, or involved in, many of the important public transactions of the time. His career was remarkable both for his own adventures and misfortunes and also for the fortunes of his family.

'Raith,' or 'The Raith' as it is frequently called in the older writings, is a well-known country seat near Kirkcaldy, in the county of Fife. When the curtain is first raised on the family history in these volumes there is disclosed a scene of turmoil and local strife indicating an entire dissolution of social order in those regions. After a description of various domestic broils, there occurs a mention of a street fight between the Laird of Raith and one Moultrie of Seafield and their respective retainers. In the third volume before us there is a full official account of this affair, in which a landowner, called the Laird of Pitcardie, was killed and many persons were hurt. It seems to have been an affray very similar to that described by Scott in his tale of the 'Abbot' as taking place between the Leslies and Seytons in the High Street of Edinburgh. Such chance-medley encounters seem not to have been rare, and show that at this time Scotland was in a very disturbed and unsettled state. James V. died in December 1542, eight days after the birth of his daughter Mary. From that time forward, for many years the Queen-mother virtually ruled. The Reformation had created a disturbing element in public and social life; the magnates of the Catholic Church were ready and prepared to extirpate the heresy by any means, and rumours were abroad of very serious measures in that direction. The severance between Queen's Men and Reformers grew wider daily. John Melville of Raith fell a victim to these controversies. He became involved in a correspondence with an illegitimate son of his own, which fell into hostile hands, and was represented as treasonable; and he was put on his trial for treason, convicted and executed on the same day, in 1548. It seems to have been a very hasty and very brutal proceeding. His estate was forfeited in consequence. The letter on which these proceedings were taken is printed by our author. It was, of course, confidential, and only could have become

known by base means and through private malice, as there is no doubt was the case.

John Melville, however, left behind him a large family, several of whom rose to considerable eminence. He married, as his second wife, Helen Napier, of the family of Merchiston, and it is with her descendants that we are at present chiefly concerned.

The forfeiture was very soon recalled in favour of John Melville, the eldest son. Of Helen Napier's children three at least rose to distinction: Robert, the Laird's second son; James, his third son, and Andrew, the seventh son. He was afterwards Sir Andrew Melville of Garvock. Robert of Murdocairnie, as he came to be called, was a confidential adviser of Queen Mary and of the Government; James of Hallhill was a courtier, familiar in the court of Mary from his earliest years, and the author of a volume of 'Memoirs' which was printed for the Bannatyne Club, and is still regarded as authoritative; and Andrew was Mary's Master of the Household, attended her in her captivity, and was present at her execution.

If we were to follow the fortunes of these men in detail, we should be at once involved in the bewildering labyrinth of the disputes about Mary, Queen of Scots. But the atmosphere is calmer now than it once was. The fervent chivalry evoked for the history, sayings, and doings of the unhappy Scottish queen has materially abated in intensity. Since the publication of the Labanoff letters, and those published by Teulet, the real character of Queen Mary's designs, as ruler of Scotland, has become so manifest as not to admit of dispute. She made no concealment of them in these confidential letters, and they are distinctly and plainly avowed, and they were her pride and glory down to the last moment of her sorrowful life.

From another superstition not less misleading we have, by the progress of knowledge, been delivered. No one now supposes that the leaders of the Scottish Reformation were rude untutored rustics, as a section of advanced thinkers were wont to flatter themselves was the case. Justice has now been done, not only to Knox himself, but to the band of cultivated and earnest men by whom he was supported. His associates embraced a large proportion of the learning, scholarship, and refinement of Scotland. Scottish scholars were renowned over Europe. It was Hume who first spread the heresy on this point, with that sycophantic tendency which disfigures his history. We were surprised to find, on

looking into the pages of an historian generally so moderate and accurate as Mr. Burton, a temporary lapse into a suspicion of this tendency. Writing of the celebrated interview between Mary and Knox, he broaches the original but fantastic notion that we have no means of judging of what passed on that occasion, because Mary could not speak Scotch, nor Knox, French.

'It must be inferred from this that her habitual language was French; and if we are to take from her the merit of disputing with Knox in the language which he learnt when a boy in East Lothian, we must concede to him the accomplishment of speaking French so well that he did not fear an encounter in that language with a very clever woman, mistress of every art for enhancing her native qualities which the highest courtly training in the world could bestow.'

It is only fair, however, to Mr. Burton to say that before he finished his paragraph the futility of the suggestion seems to have struck him; and it would have been strange if it had not, for he adds at the end of the paragraph: 'But 'indeed Knox had his own training to the task, for he had 'lived and preached in France.' Yes, he had preached in France, or where French was spoken, many a time and oft; he had spent nineteen months in the French galleys; he had been pastor of two congregations, one at Frankfort-on-Main and the other in Geneva, as well as occasionally taking duty in Dieppe; he had spent at least two years in the court of Edward VI., of whom he was one of the chaplains. He had been offered, and had refused, the bishopric of Rochester, as well as the living of All Hallows, near London. He was not only a learned, but a courtly man, and at home in all grades of society. For some unexplained reason, Mr. Burton does not inform his readers how Knox spent his time for the ten years which elapsed after he was released from the French galleys, before his return to Scotland in 1559. His employment in the court of Edward VI. is passed over in silence, and all that is said of his life for these important years—important to the history of Scotland—is that he found at Geneva 'more congenial occupation.' The intimate friend of John Calvin, as Knox was, was not likely to have been at a loss in speaking to Queen Mary.*

On this matter of the knowledge of continental languages the Scottish Reformers were quite abreast of the time.

* Sir W. Fraser has very effectively quoted from Scott's 'Abbot' the picture there drawn of Sir Robert Melville at Lochleven. One sentence which Scott puts into the mouth of the Queen indicates a truer

Probably the accomplishment was at that time much more general in Scotland than it afterwards became. George Buchanan became a professor in France and in Portugal, and Andrew Melville was liberated from the Tower that he might accept a professor's chair in the University of Sedan. But we have at this moment on our easel the portraits of two sons of a Scottish laird, one of whom was Queen Mary's most trusted envoy, and the other spoke French like a native; they were the first Lord Melville of Raith and Sir James Melville of Hallhill.

But while the light thrown upon this period of Scottish history, as disclosed in our author's pages, rather tends to discredit some spasmodic enthusiasms, to our mind they infinitely deepen our feelings of intense compassion for the beautiful and fascinating woman who was the subject of them. Granting that she was headstrong, rash, and impulsive, wholly unsuited, from her French training, to deal with such elements as she found in Scotland, and not over truthful, still she had many admirable and even noble qualities. But the conditions of the task set before her were such as to render the successful discharge of it practically impossible. Without an adviser whom she could trust, plunged at once while a mere girl into the religious turmoil of the Reformation, and dragged hither and thither by the selfish struggles of designing statesmen and partisans, even had she been Protestant her difficulties would have been great; as it was, they were insurmountable. The fixed determination, from which she never swerved, and which had been instilled into her in her French domicile, to rule in accordance with the principles of the Church of Rome, and to withstand the progress of the Reformation, was a hopeless crusade. Everything seemed to be against her. Even her marriage with the Dauphin had been so arranged, as regarded its incidents, as to rouse a spirit of not unnatural displeasure in the mind of the Queen of England. The reversionary right to the throne of England was treated too much as a right in possession, and, although the slight was passed over for the time, it was never entirely forgiven.

It is a curious problem to consider how the destinies of

---

estimate than that of Burton. He makes the Queen say: 'I have heard your apostle. I have heard Master John Knox, and were I to be perverted, I would willingly resign to the ablest and most powerful of heresiarchs the poor honour he might acquire by overcoming my faith and hope.' (*The Abbot*, ed. 1853, p. 322.)

the United Kingdom might have been affected if Francis II. and Mary had outlived Elizabeth. It is as well that the contingency did not occur.

Mary's lot was a very hard one. But we should not do justice to her memory, even in this scanty notice of her, without paying our tribute of admiration of the lofty dignity with which she met her ultimate fate. That fate was, beyond question, a gross violation of all the laws of international faith. There is only too much ground for the belief that she had persistently plotted not only for the restoration of Popery in Scotland, but also for the subversion of the Protestant dynasty in England; but her plots were the struggles of a prisoner unjustly detained, and, as she had come within the power of Elizabeth as a voluntary guest, the English Queen had no right to detain her, and certainly none to put her to death.

Of the sons of John Melville of Raith, the best known historically, although perhaps not the ablest, was the third, James—Sir James Melville of Hallhill as he afterwards became; but, as Sir William Fraser observes, he has been his own biographer, and wrote for the information of his son, as he tells us, memoirs of his life, which were printed for the Bannatyne Club. A very interesting and sparkling narrative it is, and although the spelling is archaic, the language is sufficiently vernacular. And after outlining the life of his elder brother, Sir Robert, we shall give an instance or two of the topics with which Sir James Melville deals.

As we have said, Sir Robert Melville was the second son of the John Melville of Raith to whom we have already referred. He must have been born in 1527, and had attained majority about the time when his father's calamities overwhelmed the family. But it seems—perhaps from a popular, and indeed well-founded, feeling of hardship and ill usage—the family were not without friends. Mr. Laing, in his 'Life of Knox,' vol. ii. p. 361, says:—

'Robert Melvin or Melville, the second son of Sir John Melville of Raith; in May 1555 Robert Melville, servant to the Queen's Grace, received by her special command the sum of Fifty pound, and in September following Seventy-five pound, as his pension for the Whitsunday term that year. He had long resided at the Court of France during the reign of Henry II., and was afterwards much employed in public affairs. He was knighted in 1582, and was raised to the peerage with the title of Lord Melville of Monimail in 1616, having survived till 1621, when he died at the very advanced age of 94.'

He is here said to have been long in France, although Sir

W. Fraser hardly confirms that statement. He, however, admits it may have been so, and, if it was, his command of the French language may have been a main element in his rapid rise. He is first found acting in a political capacity as an under secretary or assistant to Maitland of Lethington, on an embassy to the court of Elizabeth in 1559. He remained in England on that service until what was called the Treaty of Berwick in 1560, which was a kind of composition between the disaffected nobles and the Queen.

On the question of the marriage with Darnley, Robert Melville took the opposite side from Maitland, and fell into temporary disgrace, his estate being forfeited. But shortly afterwards Mary wrote to Elizabeth that she had pardoned Robert Melville, and had sent him to explain the circumstances of the marriage. Melville was detained in England for some time, and when he returned he found the aspect of affairs changed. Rizzio had been murdered in the interval, and the Queen and Darnley, after their marriage, had quarrelled bitterly. Sir William Fraser has printed at full in his second volume an instrument entitled a 'bond,' which is signed by some leading Scottish nobles, and by Darnley himself. The professed object of this 'bond' was to obtain for Darnley, or to aid him in obtaining, the Crown Matrimonial, as it was called, which, up to that time, Mary had not given him. This document was found in the Melville charter chest, although its terms were known before. Of course there is no reference to Rizzio in the 'bond,' but it seems to have been assumed that the removal of Rizzio was essential to the attainment of its object. Darnley afterwards disavowed this bond; but Mary never forgave him. The whole history of this undertaking, as well as the events which followed, show how well founded was our remark on the dissolution of order and society at this ill-starred epoch of the history of Scotland.

James Melville, in his 'Memoirs,' says that he took the liberty of remonstrating with Queen Mary as to her familiarity with Rizzio, mainly on the ground that it was inconsistent with her relations to others to admit a dependent to terms of that nature, and that to do so was certain to breed animosity in the minds of her other servants. James Melville mentions that he had a conversation with Rizzio himself, in which he pointed out to him the danger that he ran, and told him that when he served the Elector Palatinate the same thing happened to himself: that he was allowed to use more familiarity than the other retainers, but that,

seeing the jealousy which this created, he persuaded his master (the Elector) to allow him less liberty. Rizzio, according to James Melville, was impressed with the warning which he had received; but he said that the Queen would not permit him to alter his demeanour. We have long been of opinion that the most powerful motive for the murder of Rizzio was that as the private foreign secretary of the Queen he carried on her secret correspondence with the Catholic powers, without the knowledge of her ministers.

Events went on. We only outline them, as they are historically notorious. The intimacy between Queen Mary and Bothwell at length came to a head. The infamous outrage at Kirk of Field, by which Darnley was murdered, followed shortly after Rizzio's assassination. Within three weeks of this event the marriage of Mary and Bothwell took place. Even on the assumption that Mary had no cognisance of the counsels which led to these crimes, she gave, by her heedless and infatuated conduct, only too much reason to the public to form injurious surmises. She pursued her disastrous course and listened to no advice.

It seems, however, that Robert Melville, from this time until she went to Loch Leven, still retained her confidence, and occasionally was consulted by her. In the second volume of the work before us are printed five letters, written by Mary herself to Robert Melville, three of them dated before she went to Loch Leven and two thereafter. He was certainly there on the well-known occasion when she signed her demission of the crown. In the volume published by Teulet there is printed what appears to be a statement made on Mary's part in regard to this proceeding. It states that: 'accordingly finding her Majesty prisoner, and being surely advised that if she refused she would have to die, she was 'constrained to save her life, and compelled to sign whatever they chose to ask, but she had taken as witnesses 'George Douglas and Robert Melville, who had been sent to 'her Majesty for that event.'* Robert Melville was afterwards employed by the Queen in another and a delicate transaction regarding the same matter. After she had been

* 'Par ainsi, se trouvant Sa Magesté prisonnière, et étant seurement advertye que si elle refusoit ilz avoient résolu la faire mourir, elle fut contraincte, pour saulver sa vie, se condescendre à leur signer ce qu'ilz vouloient, mais elle preit a tesmoins George Douglas et Robert Melving qui avoient esté envoyez devers Sa Magesté pour cest effect.' (Teulet, Lettres de Marie Stuart, 1859, p. 279.)

liberated from Loch Leven she intended to have executed a revocation of the demission which she had been, as she said, compelled to sign, and Melville was employed to effect that object. But the conditions on which alone it could have been done not having been fulfilled, it never was carried out.

James Melville describes a meeting of the Council upon this very subject, the question in reality being whether the Earl of Murray was to produce an accusation against her in regard to the death of Darnley, which, apparently, he undertook not to do. James Melville's manuscript proceeds as follows. We produce it because the scene is characteristic:—

'So soon as he with his Council were within the Council house, the Duke of Norfolk asked for the accusation. The Regent desired again the assurance of the conviction by writ and seal as said is. It was answered again that the Queen's Majesty's word, being a true princess, would be sufficient enough. Then all the Council cried out, Would he mistrust the Queen, who had given such proof of her friendship to Scotland? The Regent's Council cried out also on that same manner. Then the Secretary Cecil asked if they had the accusation there. "Yes," said Mr. John Wood. With that he plucked it out of his bosom. "But I will not deliver it until her Majesty's handwriting and seal be delivered to my Lord." Then the Bishop of Orkney cleakis [snatches] the writ out of Mr. John Wood's hands. "Let me have it, I shall present it," said he. Mr. John ran after him, as if he would have had it again, or riven his clothes. Forward passed the Bishop to the Council table, and gave in the accusation. Then said to him Lord William Hauvert, chamberlain, "Well done, Bishop Turpy; thou art the frackest fellow among them; none of them all will make thy loup good," scorning him for his leaping out of the Laird of Grange's ship. Mr. Henry Balnaves only had made resistance, and called for the secretary Liddington, who tarried without the Council house; but as soon as Mr. Harry Balnaves had called for him, he came in, and rounded in the Regent's ear that he had shamed himself, and put his life in peril, by the loss of so good a friend, and his reputation for ever.

'The Regent, who had been brought by his facility to break with the Duke of Norfolk, repented him again so soon as Liddington had shown him the danger, and desired the accusation to be rendered to him again; alleging that he had some more to hand to it. But they said that they would hold that which they had, and were ready to receive any other addition when he pleased to give it in. The Duke of Norfolk had enough to do to keep his countenance: Mr. John Wood winked upon the Secretary Cecil, who smiled again upon him: the rest of the Regent's company were laughing upon [each] other: the Secretary Liddington had a fair heart. The Regent came forth from the Council house with the tear in his eye, and passed to his lodgings at Kingston, a mile from court, where his factious friends had enough ado to comfort him' (pp. 210–212).

The escape from Loch Leven terminated for the time all communication between Robert Melville and the Queen, ending, as the whole affair did, with the battle of Langside, and her flight across the border into England. The whole of this melancholy and tragic episode came to an end. It was a very cruel and dismal termination of a life which looked so bright a few short years before. The last of the letters that we have referred to from Mary to Robert Melville is dated from Bolton, in England, and acknowledges to have received from him all her clothes and jewels which she had had at Loch Leven. The letter is given in facsimile, and a very pathetic document it is. But from the battle of Langside, in 1568, down to 1587, we are left in almost entire ignorance of how the captive of Fotheringay was occupied. We hear nothing of her, but the services of Melville were again in requisition in 1586, when the Queen of England proposed to put her Scottish rival to death. At first it was not thought that the intention was serious. Queen Mary was executed in February 1587; but for some time after the event King James could obtain no information in regard to the fate of his mother, and did not know that the execution had taken place. Sir William Fraser refers to the account given by Courcelles, the French Ambassador in Scotland, of the state of King James's knowledge. It may be worth while, as the account is graphic and important, to give it in full. It is a despatch from Courcelles, dated April 3, 1587, to the King of France, and it says—

'Sir Robert Melvin and Coldingknewes were appointed to meet him within four miles of Berwick, and there the ambassadors showed how grievously the Queen of England took the death of the Scottish Queen, which was executed without her privity and at the pursuit of her Councillors, who extorted from her a Warrant for their discharge which she had signed unawares with other papers which her secretary Davison had presented her with, whom for this cause she had committed to the Tower, neither would once speak since with some of her Council for the fault they had committed in stealing such a warrant from her, and thereupon caused the Queen of Scots to be put to death, wherewith they are to be charged and not she, who was innocent, and was most grieved with it in the world and mourned therefor. But since it is impossible to remedy such an accident, she persuaded herself that the King of Scots might resolve himself, and would consider the reasons that moved her Council being such as his ambassadors were made acquainted withal, and might satisfy him so as their amity should not be broken thereupon. As for her part, she would be as good or better to him than his mother, desiring in every way his good and advancement, and hoping he would entertain the league lately con-

cluded by their ambassadors. Melvin answered that his sovereign looked not for so great an injury at the Queen of England's hands, in recompense of the amity bygone and confirmed by the late treaties: And that the King his master would not "disgest" what excuses of the Queen, or reasons soever could be alleged for such a murder; which concerned not the King alone, but the whole Scottish nation, which was offended in honour, and in their liberties violated by the Queen, having proceeded against their Queen by form of justice; which she cannot challenge against a private subject of Scotland, much less a sovereign Queen.'

It is said that James VI. took the news, if not with complacency, at least without much perturbation; but, to tell the truth, he being a mere lad of twenty, his position was a difficult one. It is probably true that between him and his mother there had been no great cordiality, and indeed little communication; and James certainly was of a somewhat cold and hard disposition; but he had, undoubtedly, every reason to avoid an open rupture with Elizabeth. Not only had he no sufficient force to enter upon hostilities, but the prospect of the succession to the crown of England would certainly have dissuaded him from taking any such step; and, short of hostilities, it is hard to see what course he could have followed with effect.

The Queen of England, or her advisers, justified the act on the ground that Mary was engaged in conspiring with the Kings of France and Spain to overthrow the Protestant dynasty in England, and to put the Queen to death. How far these allegations were or were not true it is impossible to say. That Philip was engaged in negotiations hostile to England and to Elizabeth is rendered quite certain by the fact that the Spanish Armada sailed within two years of the period in question, which proved that the preparations had been earnest and that such an end was contemplated. This, however, even if true, does not alter what we imagine to be the universal opinion—that no principle or rule of international law or friendship justified the steps that were taken by the English Government.

It was resolved to send an embassy to Elizabeth, and Melville was one of the two ambassadors sent. He found no encouragement in that quarter; his efforts were vain, and the fatal result ensued. The subsequent years between 1587 and the end of the century were only marked by constant and perpetual dissensions between individual aspirants to power. The siege of the Castle of Edinburgh, in which Robert Melville was immured, and its subsequent cession,

was one of the principal local events of that period, but it led to no special results. During the sway of the Gowries, Melville was appointed treasurer depute, but was superseded on the appointment of the Octavians, to which we referred in our recent article on the Earls of Haddington. He went to London with the King, on his accession to the crown of England, was created Lord Melville of Monimail in 1616, and died, as we have said, in 1621.

Sir Robert Melville's career was interesting, although a trifle prosaic, from its unbroken success. He was always rubbing shoulders with treason, but always emerged in high favour with the Court. As we see him in these pages, as the self-possessed, grave, trusty envoy, one would not suppose that he was the bearer of the passions, the jealousies, and the suspicions of two such crowned heads. Probably such gravity was his nature. He may have felt that the times were too critical for romance or self-conceit. But it was different with his brother James, whose adventures were full of exciting incident; and he made them the subject of the 'Memoir,' to which we have already referred.* It is a very amusing, graphic, and bright production, and we shall content ourselves with a few samples of his narrative.

We have seen already that Robert Melville was in the service of the Queen Regent at a very early age. Probably that circumstance led to his brother James being sent to France by the Government, at the age of fourteen, as a page to the young Queen. This was in 1549. He describes his journey to France in his 'Memoirs.' It would seem that he had acquired some knowledge of French, for, shortly after his arrival, he was engaged by a Scotsman, named Cockburn, to act as his interpreter in an interview which Cockburn hoped to have with Montmorency, the Constable of France. The interview took place; but the Constable was more pleased with the young interpreter than with his employer. He did not engage Cockburn, who was suspected of being a spy of Cecil; but he proposed to James Melville that he should serve him, which Melville was only too glad to do. He remained with him for several years, in the course of which he saw some active service under his command. He was present at the battle of St. Quentin, at which the Constable was taken prisoner. Melville himself escaped, and recounts his own exploits as follows:—

* Scott refers to it as one of the most important works published by the Bannatyne Club.

'I being evil hurt with the straik of a mace upon the head, was mounted again by my servant upon a Scots gelding that carried me hame thro' the enemies who were all between me and hame; and two of them straik at my head with swords because my headpiece was taken off after the first rencontre that the mace had enforced, and the two were standing between me and hame. But my skeich horse ran thro' them in a narrow gait.' 'So I came safe to La Ferre, where I met with Master Harry Killigrew, an English Gentleman' (p. 35).

James Melville remained in France until 1559, when he went to England, where he had an interview with Elizabeth, and obtained a pass to enable him to travel to Scotland. At this time Elizabeth and Mary were on very good terms. Our impression is that they had a sincere regard for each other, and were anxious to cement their friendship. Their first difference was about the proposal of Darnley's marriage, on which James Melville, writing of 1563, says —

'Bot now euery aduyse geuen be the Quen of England was euell interpret, partly for her proceadingis to the hendrance of the mariage with Charles, and partly because that Seigneur Dauid, now enterit to to be hir Hynes Frenche secretary, was not very skilfull in dyting of French letters quhilk sche did not wret ouer again with hir awen hand; for then baith the Quenis wret till uther in Frenche with ther auen handis. The answer then that the Quen wret unto the said letter, declaired some suspition and anger to have bene tane, in bursting out with some speches, that it was thochte be the Quen of England as an upgeving of the famyliarite and sisterly correspondence that had bene kepit sen the Quenis retournyng hame out of France' (p. 109).

On another occasion, a year afterwards, James Melville took the opportunity of commenting on Queen Elizabeth's knowledge of French. He thought she had interpreted Queen Mary's words in a wrong sense, and

'I said I culd find therein na offensywe word, in respect of ther gret famyliarte; alleging that albeit hir Maieste culd speak as gud Frenche as any that had never bene out of the contre, that yet sche laiketh the use of the Frenche court langage, whilk wes frank and schort, and had oft tymes twa significations, quhilk discreit and famylier friendis tok alwayes in the best part' (p. 117).

Whether this was only a courteous way of explaining the supposed offence, or whether, as is quite conceivable, it was the simple fact, apparently for the time it had the effect intended.

James Melville has some remarks upon Lord Darnley:—

'[Queen Elizabeth] then asked at me, how I lyked of him. I said, as he was a worthy subject, he was happy that had rencontrit a princess that cud dicern and reward gud service. "Yet," sche said, "ye lyk

better of yonder lang lad," pointing towardes my Lord Darley, wha as nerest prince of the bluid bure the swerd of honour that day before hir. My answer again wes, that na woman of sprit wold mak choise of sic a man, that was lyker a woman than a man; for he wes very lusty, berdles and lady facit. I had na will that sche suld think that I lyked of him, or had any ey or deling that wey: albeit I had a secret charge to deall with his mother my Lady Lenox, to purches leave for him to pass in Scotland' (p. 120).

The following passage has become well known:—

'I was ernest to be dispetchit; but sche said that I tyred schoner of hir company nor sche did of myne. I said, albeit I had no occasion ty tyre, that it was tym to retourn; but I was stayed twa dayes langer till I mycht see hir dance, as I was infourmed: quhilk being done, she inquyred at me whither sche or the Quen dancit best. I said, the Quen dancit not sa hich and disposedly as sche did. Then again, sche wisht that sche mych se the Quen at some convenient place of meating' (p. 125).

Sir James Melville in the course of his wanderings on the Continent had made the acquaintance of a well-known man, Henry Balnaves, of Hallhill. He was a man of some celebrity and considerable acquirements. He had met with Melville, and formed a very strong attachment to him, ultimately adopting him as his son and appointing him his heir. Balnaves died in 1579, and James Melville then succeeded to the estate of Hallhill. His life after the death of Queen Mary was not marked by any remarkable incident. After King James succeeded to the English throne James Melville visited him only once. He was made a privy councillor, but he retired to his property of Hallhill, and for the last years of his life was mainly occupied in preparing his Memorials. He died at the age of eighty-two in 1617.

Judging by the subsequent narrative, the Melvilles of Raith for the first half of the next century were not concerned materially in public affairs. We pass a generation before arriving at the next man of distinction, George Melville, who was the third Lord Melville of Monimail. But in the interval it is necessary, in order to preserve the continuity of the account, to deal with another distinguished man, whose ultimate fortunes were closely connected with those of the Melvilles. We allude to Alexander Leslie, the first Earl of Leven, whose career is very clearly and very ably described by Sir William Fraser, and combined many qualities both of interest and of romance. The father of Alexander Leslie belonged to the family of Balquhan, in Aberdeenshire, and in 1608 Leslie, following the example of many of the young

Scotsmen of those days, entered the service of Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, the Lion of the North as he was called, and the bulwark of the Reformed faith in Europe. In that service he rose to great distinction; he remained in it for upwards of thirty years, and we have in the third volume of the present work a very remarkable and interesting collection of papers, illustrating the services which he rendered, some of them under the hand of Gustavus himself, in his vernacular Latin. It seems that about the year 1638, perplexed by the troubles in Scotland, and their misunderstandings not only with the troops of the King but with those of the English, the authorities in Scotland were anxious that Leslie, whose reputation had spread far and wide, should return to his native country and give his countrymen the benefit of his military experience and ability. The Marquis of Hamilton had been his chief in command of the Scottish legion in Sweden, but there seems to have been a general feeling that Leslie had done his work, and that it was desirable that he should return to his native country. He was, in point of fact, on the field of battle when Gustavus himself was slain.

Then begins the long struggle maintained in Scotland on the part of the adherents of the Reformation, the history of which has never to our mind been thoroughly investigated. For the most part the narrative has been left in the hands either of those who were inclined to the Jacobite cause or those who from dislike of the Calvinistic creed of the Reformers were equally disinclined to view them with favour or approval. But we do not mean to enter upon any disquisition on this head. This only is certain, that the overwhelming majority of the people of Scotland were of one mind in the matter. They proved themselves quite able to maintain and give effect to what they thought to be their rights. Their real difficulty lay not in Scotland, but in England—in the conflict between the two extremes, between the supporters of Cromwell and his usurpation on one hand, and the friends of the exiled monarchs on the other. One can only judge of the merits or demerits of the views of the contending parties by the ultimate result, and it is to the credit of the Scottish Covenanters that their efforts culminated in the Revolution Settlement, which, though it did not affirm all their principles or any of their extreme principles, did affirm those for which the main body of the nation had contended.

It would be vain for us to attempt to follow the military

movements, which were sometimes in support of the Monarch and sometimes of the insurgents; but the objects of the Reformers in Scotland were to some extent different, not so much from those of the English nation as from those of Cromwell's followers. It is an historical mistake to suppose that the Scottish Reformers were visionaries, who did not understand practical affairs, and were endeavouring to compel the people of England to adopt their own particular creed. The reverse is true; the men who were really at the head of the Reforming party in Scotland were calm, learned, and well-judging men. They were not Republicans, but they wished to see a government formed on the basis of monarchy with sufficient safeguards for personal and constitutional liberty. We find the view which pervaded their course of action very tersely expressed in a work by one of the ablest of their number; we mean the treatise entitled 'Lex Rex,' by Samuel Rutherford. Samuel Rutherford was one of the Scottish corresponding members of the English, or Westminster, Assembly of Divines. The Assembly itself consisted, of course, only of English divines, but they admitted some corresponding members, and Rutherford was one of them. It is to him that John Milton, the Cromwellian and Republican, alludes in his well-known sonnet. Now, what Rutherford taught, as to the theory of government, was the following apparently reasonable doctrine: 'A limited and 'mixed government, such as is in Scotland and England, 'seems to me the best government, when parliaments with 'the king have the good of all the three' (monarchy, aristocracy, democracy). 'This government hath glory, order, 'unity, from a monarchy; from the government of the most 'and wisest it hath safety of counsel, stability, strength; 'from the influence of the commanders it hath liberty, 'privileges, promptitude of obedience.'*

This truly was the root of the difference between Scotland and England. Cromwell's usurpation was not approved of by the Scots, and was, in their opinion, in which the whole nation ultimately agreed, a violation of the true principles of free government. But although it cost them more than one decade of civil war, in 1690 they succeeded in giving effect to their opinions, and we leave for the present Sir Alexander Leslie with simply this remark, that he was raised to the earldom of Leven in 1641 by King Charles

* *Lex Rex;* or, The Law and the Prince, by Samuel Rutherford. Ogle and Boyd, 1843, p. 190.

himself, in consideration of the great renown which he had gained in his campaigns in Sweden.

From this point we pass over a period of nearly fifty years, and when we again resume the fortunes of the Melville family we find the third Lord Melville of Monimail in possession of the property. He was the second son of an elder brother of the Robert Melville whose history we have already recounted. He seems to have been a very worthy scion of the same stock, a strong adherent of the principles of the Reformation and a supporter of the form of Presbyterian Church government; so much so that during the Restoration he was suspected of treasonable practices, and a warrant was issued for his apprehension. Sir William Fraser gives a very interesting narrative of sundry hairbreadth escapes which the unsuspecting subject of it had made, and in the end he was compelled for his own safety to betake himself to Holland and join the other emigrants whom fate had driven to that shelter. In Holland the Prince of Orange formed a close friendship with him, and when in the end in 1688 the Prince of Orange came to the shores of England, and was welcomed as the sovereign, Lord Melville came with him, and was appointed by the new sovereign the sole Secretary for Scotland. The papers appended to Sir William Fraser's narrative, as well as his own account of the proceedings, are full of interest; but it would detain us too long to enter into any detail on a matter of history which has been so often canvassed. The chief ally that Melville had in the discharge of his office as Secretary was the celebrated Principal Carstairs, whose views of the wishes of the people of Scotland—although they ultimately proved to be entirely correct—were at variance with those of many of the Prince of Orange's advisers, and, but for the energy and tenacity with which the new Secretary kept his own path, the policy might in the end have ended in failure. What happened was exactly what might have been expected, looking to the somewhat heterogeneous band of the supporters of the new monarchy—some Episcopalians, some Jacobites, some indifferent—but all hoping for the favour of the newly-arrived potentate. In the end, as is well known, Melville had his way, acting on the advice which Carstairs had given him; the Act of 1690 was passed, which established the Presbyterian form of Church government in Scotland on a firm and absolute basis. That a great many of those who professed to be friendly to the new Government were provoked and irritated by the completeness of this measure is very clear.

Probably the feeling comes out more transparently than in most of the writers of the day in Bishop Burnet's observations on the position; for Bishop Burnet, being a Scotsman, brought up in Scotland, and who had indeed been a professor in Glasgow University, although he had become Bishop of Salisbury, yet understood very well how the country lay. But it is quite plain that he was, as might have been supposed, not particularly anxious that these Presbyterian views should receive practical effect. We refer to Bishop Burnet because he makes quite clear, what is left somewhat ambiguous in Sir William Fraser's narrative, how it was that Melville lost, as he appeared after a year or two to have lost, the confidence of the King or his advisers. Lord Melville resigned his office of Secretary in 1691. In the same year he was made an earl, and in 1695 became President of the Privy Council, which he retained until his death in 1707. Of the causes which led to the resignation of Lord Melville we are not left by our author in any real doubt. There are two papers printed in the second volume which throw a light upon the transaction which it is impossible to mistake. One is an explanation by Melville himself of the matters between him and King William which he supposed to have led to the discontent which had been evinced by the Government; the other is a very interesting paper, the precise nature of which is not very clearly explained. It purports to be a despatch by Sir James Montgomery of Skelmorlie to the Pretender or to King James II., but to be interspersed with notes apparently from Lord Melville himself. Be this as it may, the substance of the document was evidently intended for the eyes of James himself, and we should rather take it to have been in point of fact an intercepted despatch which had come into Melville's hands. It is perfectly possible and consistent with much that we find in the transactions between the leading men of this time that Skelmorlie may have hoped to obtain the assistance of Melville in his views upon the King. He would not be the first man who had vowed loyalty to the Sovereign and had seen reason to break his vow. The first of these documents, which is printed on p. 219 of the second volume before us, is entitled 'A 'Vindication of his Administration by the Earl of Melville 'to the King,' with corrections in Mr. Carstairs' handwriting. In this document, which is respectfully expressed, Lord Melville goes over the questions which were committed to him, and gives his reasons for the course which he had followed. He takes credit to himself for having enabled

King William to obtain the support of the country to the Act of 1690. He says—

'How much involved public affairs were, when by her Majesty's command I went down to the Convention of Estates in Scotland, and with what success thro' God's blessing upon my faithful endeavours I did extricate them, and answer beyond my own expectation the design of her Majesty's instructions in procuring a speedy settlement of the Government without those limitations that might be uneasy to you or a diminution of the lustre of the regal power in your Royal person, a thing I shall not trouble your Majesty with.'

With this self-gratulation he proceeds to consider one or two of the important questions. He goes on to explain that the settlement of these questions was made the foundation and pretext for raising a variety of others, which were not truly involved in the matter. In regard to the taking away of patronages, he explains that he would not have thought it right to do so but for the position of affairs in England, which made it essential that the support of the community in Scotland should be undivided.

The second of these documents is more unreserved. It purports to be written in the person of Sir James Montgomery himself, and to be a statement made to James II. The object of the communication is to represent to King James that matters had greatly improved in Scotland with a view to the success of his party. He says that King James had gained a great advantage in getting rid of Melville. He says he does not think Melville so very wise a man as the King does; that he is only a reserved man; and that he thinks his son Raith beyond him for parts. In regard to this son, he says, in another passage, that it would appear 'that the children are as bigoted as the father, whom no 'man can gain but to that which he himself thinks to be 'right.' Certainly, stronger commendation could not be expressed. It appears to us that these two documents, taken along with the statements made by Bishop Burnet, show that Lord Melville's retirement from office was really the fruit of the conspiracy got up by the Jacobite party, and by their secret, though unavowed, well-wishers, included among the professed supporters of the Government. Still, the object had been gained, and remains so to this day.

This great work once accomplished, it was to be expected many elements of jealousy, rivalry, and disloyalty combined to disturb the relations between himself and the King. We have a glimpse of this in a letter which we referred to in our review of the second portion of Macaulay's History. It

is a letter from Linlithgow to Breadalbane in October 1691, in which he says that—

'Sir W. Lockhart came to D. of Q. [Queensberry] and me with a great alarm that he had learned that Lord Raith was to go this morning post for London, and his conjecture was that it was in order to a reconcilement between Lord Melville and the Master of Stair, and therefore proposed that he might go away post as soon as he, *to contradict him there.*'

But Linlithgow goes on to say that he knew the matter was safe enough without. But, notwithstanding, December 1691 saw Breadalbane, Glengarry, and the whole party in London, as the correspondence which is quoted in that article shows. King William, having settled the Church question in Scotland, had only one object—to withdraw the troops from the Highlands that he might employ them on the Continent. That object he had intensely at heart; and to that end the assistance of Stair and Breadalbane was essential; and we see how doubtful friends turned this to account.

Earl Melville had a large family, the eldest of which held the title of Lord Raith. He seems to have been a man of great ability; and, in the correspondence among the leaders of all parties, his name is never mentioned without some expression of respect. Indeed, the Earl's detractors were in the habit of suggesting that Lord Raith was the abler counsellor of the two. But he died in 1698, and the succession to the Leven title opened by his death to a younger son of Earl Melville, David, who became third Earl of Leven and the second Earl of Melville. This result was not attained without the intervention of a court of law; and we may refer to the explanation given by Sir William Fraser of how the title of the old Swedish warrior devolved on the Melville family. David, the third Earl of Leven, Sir William Fraser says, first comes into public notice as a claimant to the earldom of Leven on the death of the two young countesses, Margaret and Catharine, the daughters of Alexander Leslie, second Earl of Leven. In his entail of the Leven estates, made in 1663, the second Earl, failing his own issue, male and female, provided them to a succession of heirs—first, to the second son of John, Earl of Rothes, whom failing, to the second son of George, Lord Melville, his brother-in-law. It so happened that the Earl of Rothes had no son, while, on the other hand, David, the third Earl of Leven, was the second son of George, Lord Melville, to whom the title was taken. But upon his application to be served, the Earl of

Rothes answered that, although he had no son, he might have a son; and, accordingly, a great and interesting lawsuit on this contention followed. The Court of Session, in the first instance, sustained Lord Rothes's view, and held that David, Lord Leven, had no title; but, after a good deal of procedure, Lord Rothes died without leaving a son, so that the question came to an end. This David, Lord Leven, however, was a very creditable descendant of the illustrious men whom we have mentioned. He went to Holland with his father when he retired in 1680; but afterwards he entered the army, and was on the field of Killiecrankie with his regiment on the day of the celebrated battle. It seems to be admitted on all hands that the Mackay's army took to their heels, and the only exception to the general flight was that of two regiments, one of which was commanded by George, Earl of Leven. There will be found in the documents printed very clear and strong testimony to that fact on the part of General Mackay himself. Some jealousy afterwards arose between them; but, at the date of the conflict, nothing could be more unreserved than his gratitude for the assistance that Lord Leven had given him. From that time forward the Earl of Leven was a prominent man in support of King William's government. He took a part in endeavouring to pacify the Highlands, and he also had the command of the Castle of Edinburgh conferred upon him, when that fort was surrendered by the Duke of Gordon in 1689.

We must refer our readers to the account of this Earl of Leven given by Sir William Fraser. It is very pleasant and agreeable reading; but no very salient events occurred after the settlement of the country in 1690. He was, however, in high favour not only with King William, but also with Queen Anne; but, on the death of the latter sovereign, party spirit, which apparently had continued to run pretty high, seemed to have affected his position, and, in the end, he was stripped of all the appointments which he had received. This, however, occurred after the accession of George I. It seems that the Earl of Leven had been acquainted with His Majesty before his accession. Sir William Fraser has inserted in his second volume a letter from the Elector of Brunswick, afterwards George I., written in the strongest terms of respect and affection. There is in Sir William Fraser's work a detailed account of certain insidious and treacherous proceedings on the part of Lord Lovat, with the design of making the King believe that

Lord Leven was in communication with the Jacobites. This is brought out very clearly; but, in the end, Lord Leven, notwithstanding his services, was unable even to procure an interview with the King, the result being that he was reduced to considerable pecuniary embarrassment. He died in 1728, but it seems very clear that what he thought the ingratitude of the Government had affected his health and his spirits greatly. He was obliged to dispose of some part of his property, and, altogether, the termination of his life was not as bright or satisfactory as the greater part of it had been.

With David, Earl of Leven, the hero of Killiecrankie, the romantic or sensational part of our retrospect terminates. The whole aspect of the community changes with the eighteenth century, and some part of the change it is not quite easy to account for. It would seem that the removal of the Court from Holyrood and the succession of James VI. to the throne of England had, at least in the northern part of the kingdom, the effect of pacifying to a large extent the elements of turmoil. The Church controversies went on, but the civil controversies, which for the century before were constant and endless, appear, with the removal of the Court, to have terminated altogether. Court intrigue was so much the occupation of the Scottish politician, that perhaps the removal of the Court to Whitehall substantially terminated the old springs of discord. In England, to some extent, the same result happened. From 1603, when King James left Scotland, to 1625, when he died, there were no intestine broils in England, and no Continental wars. On his death the smouldering elements burst forth; but how far that was or was not the fault of the Scottish ruler it is impossible now to ascertain. There can, however, be no question that with the Revolution Settlement a gentler and softer element appeared to be introduced into the management of political affairs. Judicial tribunals were more incorruptible, justice was more sure and less hasty, and thus the arts of peace began to make themselves felt as a factor in political content. And accordingly the next lords of Leven and Melville, who appear in our catalogue, were not military commanders, but were able, respected, and important magnates, doing their duty among their own people, and exercising such influence as from time to time may have been devolved upon them by the rulers. For those that remain upon our list, beyond the responsible and dignified position of representing the monarch at the meeting of the

General Assembly, there is nothing recorded of them of note in public affairs. Doubtless the Darien scheme and the South Sea Bubble, and a variety of other things, happened during this period to irritate and excite the public mind. There was a still more sensational event in the Jacobite rising of 1715, and still more in that of 1745. The former of these came to nothing, and collapsed from its own internal want of cohesion. The latter certainly evinced some great and discreditable inefficiency on the part of the Government, but it brought to light a significant and important fact, that in England the ancient dynasty had no friends at all. The love of liberty weighed much more than the love of tradition. In the lowlands of Scotland the feeling was very similar, but the clannish attachment to the Stuarts, who were of a Scottish family, gave to the operations in Scotland a kind of appearance of popular support. But when the ill-fated Pretender arrived at Derby he saw that there was no support to be looked for in England. And it was true: any elements which had given a chance of success fifty years before, had entirely and absolutely vanished.

We need hardly follow out the genealogy of this noble family, which is very clearly and lucidly deduced by our author down to the present day. In short, if some of the personages in our author's pages had not fallen upon times so stirring and picturesque, we should have given more attention to the clear and lucid narrative which characterises the whole of this work. There is a most interesting appendix of documents in the third volume, where, beginning in 1708, we are brought down to the present day, and treated to a good deal of Scottish metropolitan gossip, from sundry hands whose names are well known. These are incidents occurring in the ordinary highway of peaceful constitutional government. Our attention has been mainly directed to certain byeways and corners of Scottish history which Sir William Fraser has done much to elucidate.

ART. XI.—1. *A Plea for Liberty: An Argument against Socialism and Socialistic Legislation, consisting of an Introduction by* HERBERT SPENCER *and Essays by Various Writers.* Edited by THOMAS MACKAY, Author of 'The English Poor.' London: 1891.

2. *Speech of the Marquis of Salisbury at the Dinner of the Associated Chambers of Commerce,* March 4, 1891.

3. *Speech of Mr. Thomas Burt, M.P., at the Dinner of the Eighty Club,* December 2, 1890.

4. *Fabian Essays in Socialism.* Edited by G. BERNARD SHAW. London: 1889.

IT is evident that, in the opinion of many active politicians of opposite political views, the Home Rule question will soon cease to be the determining factor in British party politics; and men are already found eagerly casting about to discover upon what main principles, and with what definite objects, future struggles between parties are to be fought. The policy of Home Rule—that is to say, the project of establishing in Ireland a separate Parliament with an Executive Government dependent upon it—has never, in truth, had the slightest chance of ultimate success. To govern as if they were separate nations the populations inhabiting the different portions of the United Kingdom, is to attempt to run counter to all the conditions of the age in which we live. It is a policy which has gained and retained popular support in Great Britain on the condition only that its principal advocates rigidly abstained from explaining it; and it is a policy which would assuredly be shattered by a temporary victory at the polls of the ill-assorted bands who in England and Ireland follow the Home Rule standard. Had the alliance between Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell achieved a majority in 1886 over the alliance between Lord Salisbury and Lord Hartington, the attempt would have been made to establish a Parnellite rule in Ireland. So also the success of Gladstonian Liberals at the next General Election would bring about in Ireland, and between Great Britain and Ireland, difficulties and confusion for which no parallel can be found during the present century. But neither at the last nor at any other General Election could any party majority show itself capable of successfully setting back the hands of the clock, and of reviving a working system of government which has been tried and failed, and

of which all the changes of the last hundred years have only helped to demonstrate the absolute futility. To do justice to the Home Rule leaders, they have never attempted to show that the Home Rule system *would work*. They have shut their own eyes to future consequences as determinedly as they have closed ours to their present plans. Yet it may fairly be questioned how far the blindness of English Home Rulers is due to any fanatical enthusiasm for the cause they have espoused. The speeches of Lord Rosebery and Lord Herschell, of Sir William Harcourt and Mr. W. H. Fowler, for example, are not exactly in the tone of men prepared to go to the stake rather than to endure the further continuance of a hated Union. Indeed, it is largely because there are so few amongst the rising statesmen of the Liberal party who appear to care at all about Home Rule for itself that that policy seems about to take a lower place in the party programme. It was owing not to its own merits but to the temporary exigencies of British parties that the Home Rule standard was first raised by British statesmen. Other exigencies may arise, possibly have already arisen, in which a close co-operation between Gladstonian statesmen and Irish Home Rulers may prove the reverse of attractive to the English electorate. If so, it may yet be that we shall see the Home Rule flag decently folded up and reverently laid aside; of course only till circumstances should once more, in the opinion of opportunist statesmen and party managers, bring within the scope of practical politics a policy of which at the present moment its own oldest and strongest Irish friends are kindly proving the absurdity.

If, then, Home Rule for Ireland will not serve the turn of an unhappy Opposition, on what are they to build their hopes? British electors appear to care as little about so-called coercion in Ireland as they did when the present leaders of the Opposition were the principal coercionists. Indeed, agitation against coercion is only successful whilst misrepresentation as to what it consists in widely prevails. This has now been largely exposed, and the cry of coercion falls very little less flat than that of Home Rule itself.

The policy of disestablishment, again, unites in its support a very numerous and, in many respects, a very respectable following both in England and Scotland. A recent division in the House of Commons has shown an unexpectedly large minority in favour of the application of that policy to the principality of Wales. Nevertheless, as to the party advantages to be gained for the Opposition by the deliberate

adoption of disestablishment as the principal plank of the Liberal programme, party managers greatly and wisely doubt. To force on the general disestablishment of the Church of England by a majority composed of Scotch and Irish votes against the will of the immense preponderance of English representatives would be an outrage on public opinion. It would be more. It would be a distinct repudiation of the mutual understanding between England and Scotland, and between Great Britain and Ireland, incorporated in the Acts of Union of 1707 and 1801. To disestablish the Church of Scotland by means of English votes against the will of the majority of Scottish members would be undoubtedly within the power of the Parliament of the United Kingdom. Nevertheless, it would be an abuse of that power, and a flagrant disregard of honourable engagements intended to be binding. The same mutual pledges and the same safeguards which were inserted for the protection of the Church of Scotland from the English, were inserted for the protection of the Church of England from the Scotch. If both parties consent, there can, of course, be no objection to the modification of the terms upon which the kingdoms united, but to use a Scotch or an English majority to overwhelm an English or a Scottish minority in a matter affecting their National Churches, is to disregard the express language of the Act of Union upon a subject both nations agreed to be fundamental. In Scotland, whatever may be the ultimate result, it is quite certain that, for the time being, Mr. Gladstone's advocacy of immediate disestablishment has given renewed hopes to every Conservative candidate, and filled many of his own keenest party agents with a feeling akin to dismay. The Church of Scotland is a democratic Church; its roots run deep and wide through every class of society. It is governed by the people and for the people; it excites no class antagonism; and, apart from the enjoyment of parochial endowments, which are on a very modest scale, its privileges as an establishment are microscopic. As is the case with every Church Establishment, its existence is, of course, not consistent with the theory of absolute religious equality; but in Scotland that theory, even amongst the keenest disestablishers, has not yet received general acceptance.

In the matter of faulty administration the Unionist Government has given little opportunity to its opponents. In foreign affairs, in finance, in successful administration of the law, whether in Great Britain or Ireland, the Ministry,

as compared with previous Governments, has been singularly successful. When Lord Randolph Churchill threw up the lead of the House of Commons and his connexion with the Government of Lord Salisbury, the reckless expenditure of the Government was the principal accusation he laid to their charge. He has not, however, seriously attempted to lead any crusade in the cause of national economy. His successor at the Exchequer has saved the nation many millions a year. Moreover, it is extremely doubtful whether the cause of national economy is in any very great degree popular with the majority of those who in these days control the elections of members of Parliament. In what way, then, are the various loose groups of politicians who have been held together by the Home Rule fetish to become consolidated into a great and powerful party now that the Gladstonian superstition of 1886 is passing away? Once again the question must be asked, In what direction is a puzzled Opposition to turn?

If anyone cares to examine the addresses and the speeches of Gladstonian candidates, he will not remain long in doubt as to the direction in which the seeker for the popular favour of to-day looks for support. His allusions to Home Rule are necessary and formal, to disestablishment they are cold, to Mr. Gladstone monotonously fulsome. The zeal of the candidate, so far as it is political rather than personal, appears in the vigorous espousal of his leader's boasted championship of the cause of 'the masses against 'the classes.' On this text he is eloquent. The metropolitan press does far too scanty justice to the rhetorical efforts, the amazing exploits of political adventure, achieved by gentlemen put forward in the constituencies to represent the Gladstonian cause. When they arrive in the House of Commons they may not always be conspicuous for ripened wisdom, but it is on the platform that their quality shines most brightly and, unfortunately, with most effect. It is to what are known as 'social questions' that the modern candidate of the Liberal party most readily turns. In every direction he calls for the intervention of the State to improve the material condition of those whose favour he seeks. One gentleman opposes the private ownership of land on the simple ground that the land belongs to the 'people.' Another thinks to prove his zeal for the working classes by his hostility to the capital upon which they are dependent. To promise high wages and easy hours of labour as the reward of political support has become the commonplace of election-

eering speeches. How are these promises to be redeemed? How is the State to intervene usefully? And are there no limits to State intervention within which men may rule their own conduct, and carry on their own business, according to their own will?

The change that has come over us must indeed be a great one; it must be a change which has completely transformed political theories, and profoundly modified the character and tendencies of British parties, if it can be plausibly contended by able and thoughtful men that we have reached a stage where Liberty itself is in danger from the attacks of aggressive modern Liberalism. Yet, in the volume of Essays before us, the name of which we have put at the head of our article, we find one writer after another vigorously protesting, in the name of Liberty, against the growing tendency of recent years to subject, in the supposed public interest, to State regulation the everyday lives and conduct of individual men. The thoughtful Radical, philosopher or working man, sees clearly enough the dangers towards which the bulk of his party seems determined to steer. An opportunist statesman or a party wirepuller naturally makes it his sole end to trim his sails to the popular breezes of the moment. Of set purpose he shuts his eyes to ultimate consequences. With him the horizon is bounded by the next General Election. It is too much to expect that many Radicals, or, indeed, that many politicians of any party, should be both thoughtful and courageous. It is so simple and so pleasant loudly to shout with the prevailing mob. No wonder so few public men aspire to do more! Yet there are amongst us some men of sterner stuff, some Liberals and Radicals inspired by the old spirit which animated their predecessors in days when the Liberal party was struggling for freedom. We have seen no stronger or more vigorous argument in favour of 'Liberty for Labour' than is contained in the essay of Mr. Howell, M.P., in the volume under review. Mr. George Howell is a Radical of the Radicals. Originally a working bricklayer, secretary to the Reform League in the stormy period after 1864, parliamentary secretary to the Trades Union Congress from 1871 to 1875, and now a member of Parliament, he comes forward to protest, in the name of Liberty, against those projects for limiting by law the hours in which full-grown men may labour—proposals advocated by the New Trades Unionism and greedily accepted by 'New Liberals' as a substitute for that Home Rule cry which they have begun to recognise has lost its

power to charm. The demand, however, for an Act of Parliament to fix the length of a working day is but one among many evidences of the growing habit of Englishmen to look for the improvement of their lot rather to State regulation than to their own efforts. And let it be observed that this tendency is comparatively a very modern tendency amongst English reformers.

The efforts of the older Liberals and reformers, down almost to our own time, were aimed in exactly the opposite direction, viz. at striking off the legal fetters which limited the independent action of the individual. Men are very apt to forget how, in times more primitive than our own, the law attempted—undoubtedly in what was then believed by the ruling class to be the public interest—to prescribe in almost every direction the conduct of men's lives. To fix wages by law, to prescribe for men what they should eat and drink, and how they should be clothed, at what rate of interest they should borrow money, at what trades and in what places and in what manner they should work, seemed to our ancestors, at one time or another, to be fair subjects for the exercise of the wisdom of Parliament. Sometimes Parliament in so acting was merely giving legislative effect to what previously the sanction of custom had been sufficient to enforce. The statute law and Royal charters took the place of the ordinances of the guilds. Men had recourse to the State to enforce rules which they found it had become increasingly difficult to enforce by any other means. In a multitude of instances the effort was to uphold a monopoly of trade or of labour, which monopoly experience was beginning to show could no longer be perpetuated except by the strong hand of the law. The spirit of individual liberty had become too strong to be restrained by a less powerful authority. It is known that James Watt was ejected beyond the burgh bounds of Glasgow, and had to take refuge within the privileges of the University, because, in the opinion of the guild of Glasgow hammermen, the whole community would 'suffer skaith' by the competition of this new settler amongst them. Under their charters the Royal burghs of Scotland frequently claimed the right to prohibit competition in their special trades far beyond their own confines. It was no doubt a step forwards when the protection of the State began to be claimed for traders against the competition of foreign rivals only. One of the latest Acts passed by the Parliament of Scotland was to provide that corpses should be buried in wool and not in linen as theretofore. It is true that these

regulations were demanded and framed in the special interest of particular classes; but we believe that, on the whole, they were considered useful to the people at large. The writer* of the essay on the 'Limits of Liberty' takes very high ground, and bids the new school of social reformers to beware of 'all State attempts to improve humanity' till they have carefully examined the results of past experience.

'There are all the statutes of Plantagenet days against forestalling and regrating and usury; there are the old sumptuary laws, the fish laws, the cloth laws, the tippling Acts, the Lord's Day Observance Act, the Act against making cloth by machinery, which, by its prohibition of "divers devilish contrivances," drove trade to Holland and to Ireland, and thus made it needful to suppress the Irish woollen trade. Still, on the whole, State interference shows signs of becoming weaker and weaker as civilisation progresses. . . . We should accord the same worship to Liberty in politics that we accord to Honesty in private dealings, hardly permitting ourselves to believe that its violation can in any case be wise or permanently expedient; while leaning to Liberty as we lean to Truth, and deviating from it only when the arguments in favour of despotism are actually overwhelming, our aim should be to find out by study of history what those classes of acts are in which State interference shows signs of becoming weakened, and as far as possible to hasten on the day of complete freedom in such matters.'

Mr. Herbert Spencer, in the interesting introduction prefixed to these essays, strongly enforces the theory that the modern tendency is a backward tendency—one, in short, to recur to the old *régime* of society. The progress we are asked to make is from 'freedom to bondage.' To establish this he contemplates the general consequences that may be expected to result from legislation inspired by the new spirit. He declines to look at each new step in this direction as if it were an isolated fact, to be judged solely with reference to the special evil it is intended to remedy. Statesmen are far too little given to consider the ultimate operation of their action. Political and social institutions change; and 'the universal metamorphosis' which we see in nature 'displayed alike in the development of a plant and 'in every seed which germinates on its surface, holds also of 'societies whether taken as wholes or in their separate 'institutions.' No one could have foreseen in the primitive workshop the germ of the great factory system of to-day, or in the voting, some fifty years ago, of 30,000*l.* in aid of education the beginning of a system under which 10,000,000*l.*

* 'Limits of Liberty,' by Wordsworth Donisthorpe.

a year would be raised by the State, and all children compulsorily educated upon pain of the imprisonment of their parents.

'No one would have dreamt that out of so innocent looking a germ would have so quickly evolved this tyrannical system, tamely submitted to by people who fancy themselves free!'

Society must be constructed, says Mr. Spencer, following Sir Henry Maine, upon the basis either of *status* or *contract*. There must be co-operation of one kind or another if society is to exist at all; and this co-operation must be either voluntary or compulsory.

'The system must be one in which the individual is left to do the best he can by his spontaneous efforts, and get success or failure according to his efficiency, or one in which he has his appointed place, works under coercive rule, and has his appointed share of food, clothing, and shelter. The system of voluntary co-operation is that by which, in civilised societies, industry is now everywhere carried on. Under a simple form we have it in every farm, where the labourers, paid by the farmer himself and taking orders directly from him, are free to stay or go as they please; and of its more complex form an example is yielded by every manufacturing concern, in which under partners come clerks and managers, and under these timekeepers and overlookers, and under these operatives of different grades. In each of these cases there is an obvious working together, or co-operation, of employer and employed, to obtain in one case a crop, and in the other case a manufactured stock. And then at the same time there is a far more extensive, though unconscious, co-operation with other workers of all grades throughout the society. For while these particular employers and employed are making other things needed for the carrying on of their lives, as well as the lives of all others, this voluntary co-operation, from its simplest to its most complex forms, has the common trait that those concerned work together by consent. There is no one to force terms or to force acceptance. It is perfectly true that in many cases an employer may give or an employé may accept with reluctance: circumstances, he says, may compel him. But what are the circumstances? In the one case there are goods ordered, or a contract entered into, which he cannot supply or execute without yielding; and in the other case he submits to a wage less than he likes because otherwise he will have no money wherewith to procure food and warmth. The general formula is not, "Do this, or I will make you:" but it is, "Do this, or leave your place and take the consequences."'

On the other hand, compulsory co-operation is exemplified by an army, where the daily duties, in peace and in war, are performed under command without room for any liberty of choice.

'In this case the understanding is, "Obey in everything ordered, under penalty of inflicted suffering, and perhaps death." This form of co-operation, still exemplified in an army, has in times gone by been the form of co-operation throughout the civil population. Everywhere, and at all times, chronic war generates a militant type of structure, not in the body of soldiers only, but throughout the community at large. Practically, while the conflict between societies is actively going on, and fighting is regarded as the only manly occupation, the society is the quiescent army, and the army the mobilised society—that part which does not take part in battle, composed of slaves, serfs, women, &c., constituting the commissariat. Naturally, therefore, throughout the mass of inferior individuals constituting the commissariat there is maintained a system of discipline identical in nature, if less elaborate. The fighting body being, under such conditions, the ruling body, and the rest of the community being incapable of resistance, those who control the fighting body will, of course, impose their control upon the non-fighting body; and the *régime* of coercion will be applied to it with such modifications only as the different circumstances involve. Prisoners of war become slaves. Those who were free cultivators before the conquest of their country become serfs attached to the soil. Petty chiefs become subject to superior chiefs; these smaller lords become vassals to over-lords; and so on, up to the highest—the social ranks and powers being of like essential nature with the ranks and powers throughout the military organisation; and while for the slaves compulsory co-operation is the unqualified system, a co-operation which is in part compulsory is the system that pervades all grades above. Each man's oath of fealty to his suzerain takes the form, "I am your man."'

Throughout Europe, and especially in this country, the system of voluntary co-operation gradually replaced the compulsory system of earlier times. An industrial population sprang up and gathered into the towns, where it was more independent of the militant class. Here co-operation, in spite of partial interference by municipal governments and guilds, was voluntary; 'production and distribution 'were mainly carried on under agreement—alike between 'buyers and sellers, and between masters and workmen.' The social system spread from the towns to the country, money payments replaced the older services, divisions of rank became less strict, and class power diminished, 'until 'at length restraints exercised by incorporated trades having 'fallen into desuetude, as well as the rule of rank over rank, 'voluntary co-operation became the universal principle. 'Purchase and sale became the law for all kinds of services, 'as well as for all kinds of commodities.'

Mr. Herbert Spencer vigorously protests against a return

to our former bondage, for the new system which finds favour with modern democrats is

'in principle, if not in appearance, the same as that which during past generations was escaped from with so much rejoicing. As fast as the *régime* of contract is discarded, the *régime* of status is of necessity adopted. As fast as voluntary co-operation is abandoned, compulsory co-operation must be substituted. Some kind of organisation labour must have, and if it is not that which arises by agreement under free competition, it must be that which is imposed by authority. Unlike in appearance and names as it may be to the old order of slaves and serfs, working under masters who were coerced by barons, who were themselves vassals of dukes or kings, the new order wished for, constituted by workers under foremen of small groups, overlooked by superintendents, who are subject to higher local managers, who are controlled by superiors of districts, themselves under a central government, must be essentially the same in principle in the one case as in the other: there must be established grades and enforced subordination of each grade to the grades above. This is a truth which the communist or socialist does not dwell upon. Angry with the existing system under which each of us takes care of himself, while all of us see that each has fair play, he thinks how much better it would be for all of us to take care of each of us, and he refrains from thinking of the machinery by which this is to be done. Inevitably, if each is to be cared for by all, the embodied all must get the means—the necessaries of life. What it gives to each must be taken from the accumulated contributions; and it must therefore require from each his proportion —must tell him how much he has to give to the general stock in the shape of production, that he may have so much in the shape of sustentation. Hence, before he can be provided for, he must put himself under orders, and obey those who say what he shall do, and at what hours, and where, and who give him his share of food, clothing, and shelter. If competition is excluded, and with it buying and selling, there can be no voluntary exchange of so much labour for so much produce, but there must be apportionment of the one to the other by appointed officers. This apportionment must be enforced. Without alternative the work must be done, and without alternative the benefit, whatever it may be, must be accepted. For the worker may not leave his place and offer himself elsewhere. Under such a system he cannot be accepted elsewhere, save by order of the authorities. And it is obvious that a standing order would forbid employment in one place of an insubordinate member from another place; the system could not be worked if the workers were severally allowed to go or come as they pleased. With corporals and sergeants under them, the captains of industry must carry out the orders of their colonels, and these of their generals, up to the council of the commander-in-chief; and obedience must be required throughout the industrial army as throughout a fighting army. "Do your prescribed duties and take your appointed rations" must be rule of the one as of the other.'

As a matter of fact, institutions as they grow are moulded less in accordance with the ideas of their founders than in the spirit of the administrative system that has been provided. 'A cardinal trait in all advancing organisation is the 'developement of the regulative apparatus.' In other words, the officials who have to work institutions of a complex and elaborate character become the masters of the situation. With our present system of voluntary co-operation, with its free contract and competition, production and distribution need no official oversight. Under the influence of individual wants and energies there has been evolved spontaneously that wonderful system 'whereby a great city has its food 'daily brought round to all doors, or stored at adjacent 'shops; has clothing for its citizens everywhere at hand in 'multitudinous quantities; has its houses and furniture and 'fuel ready made or stocked in each locality;' and so throughout the kingdom. To substitute for this industrial *régime* of willinghood a *régime* of industrial obedience would necessitate an army—or rather a hierarchy—of officials, rising caste above caste, all of them from the highest to the lowest united by the interests common to officialism—the interests of the regulators *versus* those of the regulated. Mr. Spencer reiterates the warning that 'the working of 'institutions is governed by men's characters.' And men's characters are not such as to prevent, in circumstances such as these, the growth of a despotic bureaucracy. Trades unions—or at all events the newer trades unions—show no regard whatever for the liberties of men of their own class; and individuals amongst them claiming only their most elementary rights have to owe their protection from the tyranny of their fellow operatives to the intervention of the police. The history of learned societies, of joint stock companies, of organised parties, is the same. The administration, the staff—call it what you will—absorbs all authority, and is prone to use it selfishly in its own interests. As an indirect example Mr. Spencer points significantly to the

'behaviour of the so-called Liberal Party—a party which, relinquishing the original conception of a leader as a mouthpiece for a known and accepted policy, thinks itself bound to accept a policy which its leader springs upon it without consent or warning; a party so utterly without the feeling and idea implied by liberalism as not to resent this trampling on the right of private judgment which constitutes the root of liberalism; nay, a party which vilifies as renegade Liberals those of its members who refuse to surrender their independence!'

The characters of men are wanting in that sentiment of

justice which insists on personal freedom and is solicitous for the like freedom of others. Socialism is to be resisted mainly in the interest of the employed, for under it they must inevitably sink under a bureaucratic despotism such as the world has never yet seen.

We have thought it right to give a full account of Mr. Herbert Spencer's 'Introduction.' His general views are well known. With him the 'liberty of the subject'—the freedom from legal restraint of the energies of individual men—is the only foundation on which we can build if we would attain a permanently higher civilisation. In strong contrast are the opinions of those, amongst whom may be named the late Mr. Stanley Jevons, who strongly argue that the sole test of any restriction upon liberty is the expediency of each particular restriction, considered from the point of view of the general welfare. In practical legislation Mr. Jevons tells us to discard all belief in absolute rights or inflexible principles. Legislation is no more a science than the making of a ship or a steam engine is a science. There may be general sciences of ethics, of economics, of jurisprudence, which may assist us in legislation, as there are sciences the comprehension of which assists us in the construction of ships and steam engines. But in each case we are doing practical work; 'and before the principles can 'be brought down into practice, they run into infinite com-'plications and break up into all kinds of exceptions and 'apparent anomalies.' *

For our own part we are unable to agree entirely either with Mr. Spencer or with Mr. Stanley Jevons. To treat with disrespect the general principles of science, natural or political, would soon involve the shipbuilder or the statesman in the direst confusion. No practical construction could be established in defiance of general laws. On the other hand, it is easy to put cases where the belief in a supposed universal principle has been carried to extreme lengths. Should we be acting rightly and with wisdom in abolishing compulsory vaccination? Surely this depends upon two questions: First, Does vaccination prevent or greatly diminish smallpox? Secondly, If so, will the public be sufficiently protected from smallpox if parents of children are left free to dispense with vaccination? The general public will not consent to lay itself open to the ravages of disease on the ground solely that the exercise of

* 'The State in Relation to Labour,' by W. Stanley Jevons.

the authority of the State is restrictive of the 'liberty of 'the subject.' The philosopher does not perhaps love health less than 'the man in the street,' but he certainly loves freedom more. Indeed, to the latter the question may present itself as to whether 'we shall *live* all slaves or *die* 'all free men,' and he may welcome the intervention of a benevolent Cæsar!

Mr. Jevons discards the theories of the Evolutionists. He declares that the State is justified in passing *any* law for doing *any* act which without ulterior consequences adds to the sum total of happiness. 'Good done is sufficient justi-'fication for any act.' A sweeping conclusion truly, which may startle 'the man in the street' almost as much as the counter propositions of Mr. Spencer! For practical purposes, in nine cases out of ten, the legislative powers of the State are exercised by the majority of the House of Commons, and its executive functions are performed under their immediate supervision. Is an assembly of six hundred or seven hundred gentlemen to act upon each and every occasion as it may seem good in its eyes without regard to general principles? In all the varieties of human institutions which the world has seen, none has yet been discovered possessed of wisdom, rectitude, and strength to govern successfully in such a fashion. Of all possible authorities, the least fit for such work is a crowd. And six hundred gentlemen, though they are representatives of the people, form a crowd. 'Wrest once the law to your authority' is the incessant petition of those who would fly from instead of facing difficulty. Legislation, as Mr. Jevons repeatedly declares, is practical work, and in this work we must have regard to the principles which have been deduced from our previous experience. It was with dismay that the thoughtful public heard a few years ago Mr. Gladstone's airy dismissal to Jupiter and Saturn of the principles of political economy, at the very time when he was endeavouring to build up in Ireland a new system of landed tenure. Those principles remained, nevertheless, to govern the situation much more effectively than Mr. Gladstone's Land Act. Our wise legislators had fixed Irish rents for a period of fifteen years without apparently recollecting that the prices of agricultural produce might vary. Prices fell, and before five years had elapsed a general revision of Mr. Gladstone's rents had become necessary! If Parliament is to assume the character of perpetual regulator of the price of land in Ireland,

farewell to all hope of the return of agricultural quiet and prosperity to that country!

The tendency of party leaders to think only of the special exigencies of the moment is a natural, but nevertheless a very dangerous, one. It seems to be a necessity of successful party leadership to profess to have a remedy for every 'ill that flesh is heir to.' At elections it is the quack rather than the sound practitioner that gains popular applause; and should a party in which quackery is beyond all comparison the most powerful element gain the ascendant, the body politic will have to make trial of some very novel prescriptions. Never was there a time when it was more necessary to guard against the weakness of smoothing difficulties in our political pathway by sacrificing general and permanent interests to party and momentary exigencies. And it is to this result that the teaching of Mr. Jevons, if reduced to practice, would lead.

We must return, however, to Mr. Herbert Spencer's 'Plea for Liberty.' It is clear that, apart from our theories of government, modern life tends to exalt the community, and to make of less comparative importance the individual citizen. Country life, every recurring census shows us, is being replaced by urban life. We have already largely become, and are increasingly becoming, a nation of townsmen. It is sometimes erroneously supposed that this is due solely to the fact that the cultivation of the land gives employment to fewer people than heretofore. Those who supply the agriculturists have themselves left the country for the town. The growth of manufacturing industry on a large scale in great centres has, of course, drawn labour from agricultural employment to itself, thereby enhancing the value of the rural labourers that remain behind. But the village tradesmen—the tailor, the shoemaker, the grocer—themselves feel the same attraction towards the same centres. Their customers are more easily supplied from these centres, which are in truth nowadays much more accessible to large rural districts surrounding them than are the rural villages themselves. Whether we like it or not, everything in the present day tends to the agglomeration of great multitudes of the people in towns, and against the dispersion of the working population through country districts. The active and energetic find opportunities of advancement in the towns which the country does not and cannot afford them. Yet it has seriously been argued, as a weighty reason for the establishment of parish councils, that by affording an opening in

public life to the ambitions of aspiring countrymen much will be done to check the growing depopulation of the country! The causes are far too deep for any such petty changes seriously to modify the tendency of the times. We are, however, not so much concerned here in pointing out the causes of the increase of urban life as in calling attention to the fact that the conditions of life such as we see them to-day are very different to what they were formerly, and that they are comparatively novel. There has been no time for the growth of tradition and custom, which often regulate with more than the force of law the old-established habits of society. Where the same trade has gone on in the same place and under the same conditions generation after generation for centuries, it will generally be found that custom has definitely settled those questions which are now agitating our newly arisen industrial communities.

Under our new conditions new wants are felt, new regulations are naturally called for; and the State will be invoked to give order and method where in former days its intervention was not required. Drainage, lighting, water supply are felt nowadays to be almost as much the interest of the community as the maintenance of roads. Time out of mind the State has compelled the parish to maintain its roads, and the county its bridges. These matters were not left to individual energy. People who live together in close community incur obligations to each other and to the community which did not fall upon the shoulders of their ancestors. Principles have not changed, but conditions of life have. Till people herded together in great communities, their common wants were few. Now their common wants are many, and are increasing; and we doubt, along with Mr. Jevons, whether any principle can be found to declare at any precise point that the interference of the State to supply these wants by means of its own agency is inadmissible. At any rate, the tendency of the age is evidently in the direction of life in large communities; and, as the Poet Laureate wrote half a century ago—

'Now the individual withers, and the world is more and more.'

The great question is whether, as a result of experience rather than as a conclusion from *à priori* reasoning, State interference does or does not secure for the people benefits which altogether outweigh attendant disadvantages. Nothing can be more laudable than the motives which have induced modern Parliaments to regulate by means of official super-

vision the conduct of many of our most important commercial businesses and trades. It is enough to refer to the mining and to the shipping industries. Sir Thomas Farrer, in telling the history of legislative attempts to prevent the use of unseaworthy ships, evidently doubts whether on the whole these attempts have been productive of benefit. His language on this subject is most instructive, and we make no apology for quoting his words:—

'The operation of the measures which have recently been adopted by Parliament in order to secure further safety is extremely interesting. One of these remedies is administration—viz. the power given to the Board of Trade to detain unseaworthy ships, a power which since the Plimsoll agitation has been exercised through the means of a large staff of local surveyors in most of the ports of the United Kingdom. Another remedy is judicial—viz. liability to criminal prosecution for sending an unseaworthy ship to sea. The latter of these remedies has always been difficult, because with all the intermediate agencies which modern trade requires, it is seldom easy to bring home culpability or negligence to the owner, whose greed may notwithstanding have been the real cause of the unseaworthiness. But the criminal remedy has been rendered absolutely ineffectual by the administrative remedy. When a shipowner has been prosecuted for sending an unseaworthy ship to sea in a grossly unseaworthy condition, and the fact has been distinctly proved, the answer has been that the Board of Trade might have stopped the ship and did not do so; as if the Board of Trade and its officers were ubiquitous and omnipresent. But, however this may be, the answer has been and will be accepted by judge and jury as conclusive in answer to a criminal charge; and the criminal remedy for culpable unseaworthiness is one which can seldom if ever be enforced. Nor is the working of the administrative remedy satisfactory. Many unsafe ships are actually detained, and more are indirectly deterred from going to sea. But the appeal for damages which is given from a responsible department to a judge and jury, who do not perhaps know the stem from the stern of a ship, is an appeal from Philip sober to Philip drunk, and tends to cripple administrative action. On the other hand, to subject the shipowner to detention without appeal would be to subject him to possible official tyranny and caprice. Again, the power of detention in isolated cases involves much more extensive interference. When a particular ship is detained, say, for overloading, the shipowner retorts with much justice, "Why do you stop me when on the point of going to sea? Why not tell me beforehand what you require?" And this the Board of Trade cannot do without laying down fixed rules both as to load line and as to other matters which would place the whole mercantile marine in official fetters. Such are the difficulties of interference, and they are as yet unsolved.'*

* 'The State in relation to Trade,' by Sir Thomas Farrer.

After all, it was not by the employment of unseaworthy ships that the British mercantile marine, for the most part left to itself, gained the carrying trade of the world.

Even Sir Thomas Farrer, sympathising as he does with the democratic sentiments of the day, and aware as few other men are of the good which can be done by wise official regulation, feels it right to conclude his little volume with a word of caution. He, like the Evolutionists, holds that there is a real danger to true freedom, and to the sort of character which it creates, in the constant demand for Government interference.

'Treat grown men or women as incapable of judging and acting for themselves, and you go far to make them incapable. Our daily life is beginning already to be hedged round by inspections, regulations, and prohibitions. The coming democracy has much of promise in it; but one of its failings is impatience. It cannot bear to see an evil slowly cure itself which can, as it imagines, be cured at once by the use of its own overwhelming force. It is passionately benevolent, and passionately fond of power. To preserve individual liberty in trade, as in other matters, from the impatient action of philanthropy, will probably be one of the great difficulties of the future.'

The increased superintendence which the State is inclined to exercise over the railway companies is another marked example of the tendencies of the times in which we live. Railway companies are doubtless the creation of the Acts of Parliament under which they have acquired their powers. Virtually a railway company is in possession of something very like a statutory monopoly of the carrying trade of its own district; and a combination of railway companies, were the State to abstain from all interference, might dictate its own terms to the kingdom. It cannot, therefore, be maintained that State regulation of railways, such as is provided by the Railway and Canal Traffic Act of 1888, is contrary to sound principle. Nevertheless, the State has attempted a Herculean task—one for which it is hardly qualified—in undertaking of its own authority to prescribe the rates at which every class of goods is to be carried in any part of the country. The decisions come to on behalf of the Board of Trade by Lord Balfour and Mr. Courtney Boyle, after the most exhaustive inquiry, are now being reconsidered by a joint committee consisting of five peers and five members of Parliament. The question is not so much whether this action of the State is legitimate from the point of view of sound principle, as to whether it is likely to be successful. The railway companies, though they enjoy great statutory

privileges, are nevertheless great trading concerns; and can they trade successfully if the decision of matters of business of vital importance to the trade is taken out of their hands?

Sir Thomas Farrer, we have seen, talks of 'the impatient 'action of philanthropy,' and here we notice an important distinction between the motives which until recently prompted the increase of State intervention, and those which at the present time actuate the leaders of the 'New 'Unionism' in their demands for the further State regulation of labour. It was in the cause of philanthropy and humanitarianism that the Factory Acts, the Mine Regulation Acts, and the Merchant Shipping Acts were passed.

There is to-day no Lord Shaftesbury to lead the van. The promoters of the Eight Hours Bill are endeavouring to get the State to come to the aid of workmen in making their bargains with their employers. The State intervention, which is asked for, differs in kind, and not merely in degree, from that with which we have hitherto been familiar. The law is requested to settle between the contracting parties that which is the very gist of the bargain between them. The length of the miner's day and the amount of his daily pay are correlative terms. As the one varies, so does the other. Ought the law to prevent, and can it prevent, men working long hours for extra pay? The employers for the sake of their profits are willing to pay, and the workmen for the sake of themselves and their families are anxious to work. Who shall say them nay?

On this important question of the eight hours day, statesmen and politicians are acting after their kind. The strongest men among them are doing their duty and speaking out. The greater number are waiting upon Providence. Amongst the former it is interesting to find that language essentially the same is held by public men so different in their general tendencies as Lord Salisbury, Mr. John Morley, and Mr. Thomas Burt. A Royal Commission has been appointed, consisting of men of the most various interests, under the chairmanship of Lord Hartington, 'to inquire 'into the questions affecting the relations between employer 'and employed, the combinations of employer and of 'employed, and the conditions of labour, which have been 'raised during the recent trade disputes in the United 'Kingdom. And to report whether legislation can with 'advantage be directed to the remedy of any evils that may 'be disclosed, and if so in what manner.' An inquiry much

more likely to produce public benefit indirectly by proving the readiness of men in authority to weigh impartially the wants and prejudices of every class and by giving the fullest ventilation to every complaint, than to result in valuable suggestions laying the foundation for important legislation. The gigantic inquiry into the condition of agriculture, which owed its origin to the bad times of a few years ago, resulted in the collection of an immense mass of the most interesting information. It has not, however, paved the way for legislation more important than the Compensation for Improvements-Act, a measure which the rapidly growing ability of the farmer class to take care of itself in making bargains renders of little real utility.

Lord Salisbury on the suitable occasion of the meeting last March of the Associated Chambers of Commerce took great pains to assure the public that the appointment of the Royal Commission did not indicate the slightest doubt on the part of the Government of the necessity of maintaining the essential principle upon which our industrial legislation is at present founded.

'The rule is, that with respect to the labour of women and children—of those who are unprotected—Parliament has a right to interfere; that with respect to all things which affect the health of the community Parliament has a right to interfere with industry, but that with the ordinary labour of the adult man Parliament has not a right to interfere. If you once leave that sound ground of principle, if you once pass the Rubicon which separates you from the domain of Socialism, you will part with your commercial and industrial supremacy, and some decades or generations hence will sink to your old ground with all lost for which you once struggled.'

The Prime Minister went on to show that it was the merest delusion to suppose that legislation of this kind could be confined to miners. As a matter of principle, it is impossible to separate the miner from the quarryman, the quarryman from the navvy who works on the railway, the navvy from others who work on the railway. 'Each industry is chained 'to another industry by a link of agreement that you cannot 'break' if once the principle itself is conceded in the case of miners. And how can a law of this kind, which it is the wish and interest of both employer and employed to evade, be enforced? 'The only means of carrying out the sinister 'object of the law would be to multiply regulations, and to 'appoint inspectors, until the gradually lengthening evil of 'red tape would stifle and throttle the industries of the 'country it touched.'

Almost as telling as the solemn words of warning of the Prime Minister was the remarkable speech of Mr. Burt last December at a dinner of the Eighty Club. Mr. Burt's very first speech in public, he himself tells us, was when, as a pit lad, he supported the cause of shorter hours. He has never ceased to advocate that cause. 'When the alternative 'has presented itself, either of a reduction of wages or the 'lengthening of the hours of labour—and wages and hours 'go very much together, although this is too often ignored— 'whenever the alternative has been presented to me, as an 'adviser of the working man, I have almost invariably re-'commended them, if I saw one or the other was inevitable, 'to accept even lower wages rather than to lengthen their 'hours of labour beyond a reasonable limit. But I am 'against, strongly against, the fixing of the hours of adult 'men by Act of Parliament.' If we reduce the number of hours we shall inevitably reduce the wage also; if we shorten the hours beyond a certain point, we shall in many trades create the greatest difficulty in the way of carrying on the business at all; the law will be a dead letter unless we prohibit overtime, and the only possible means of preventing the evasion of a law against overtime 'is to have a 'huge army of inspectors or of policemen and spies.'

If Mr. Gladstone and Sir William Harcourt spoke half as definitely, the clamour for legislative restrictions, by what Mr. Burt prefers to call the 'young' Unionism, would almost cease; but then how could Gladstonian candidates win seats by pledging themselves to an Eight Hours Bill? It is not every political leader who thinks that it is any business of his to lead. Wise statesmanship consists in abstaining from taking sides, even on a question of supreme national importance, till the moment when a supposed majority of the electorate proves it to be 'ripe.' This unworthy teaching has been too common in recent years. Mr. Burt at the Eighty Club, with Sir George Trevelyan in the chair, gave noble advice to the young candidates of his party by whom he was surrounded. The one word of advice he would give to candidates was to 'go straight, though they 'might not win,' and never to forget the words of Burke to the electors of Bristol: 'Your representative owes you not 'his industry only, but his judgement, and he betrays, 'instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion.' Alas! It is not only by candidates for parliamentary honours and by young politicians that this teaching requires to be taken to heart.

It is, however, not so much by the fighting of great pitched battles such as would be required to carry an eight hours bill into law, as by quiet and almost unnoticed steps in our general system of government, that the authority of the State is daily becoming more and more predominant. The citizen is expected to do less for himself as the State is called upon to do more. The maintenance by the State of those who cannot maintain themselves has been the principle of the Poor Law. The citizen who can support himself, or whose relations can support him, has no right to be housed and fed out of taxes raised from his neighbours. With regard to education, the State began by giving a small but ever increasing grant to assist the voluntary efforts of the people to provide education for themselves. As the grants increase, so, of course, do State supervision and regulation. At length education is made compulsory, and children, whose parents cannot afford to pay school fees, are paid for out of the rates. We are now taking another step forward. This consists in the total abolition of the test of inability to pay school fees, as a condition precedent to claiming their payment out of taxes. The State is now undertaking to pay for the education of children whose parents are perfectly competent to pay for it themselves. Similar, though less noticed, changes are taking place in our Public Health Code. The law, for instance, requires that in certain cases of infectious disease the sanitary authority in London should cause to be disinfected bedding, clothing &c. taken from an infected house, and should return it to the owner. The proposal of the Government in their amending Bill of the present session was to require the sanitary authority to perform this duty at the public expense, 'or where the owner was a person of ability to 'pay, at such reasonable charge as might be fixed.' The House of Commons omits the words in inverted commas. Again, a man suffering from infectious disease is made subject to a heavy penalty if he carries on his ordinary trade or business in such a manner as to spread the disease. The Government Bill proposed that the sanitary authority should allow to a man prohibited from carrying on his business under this section reasonable compensation (coming, of course, from the rates) 'where by reason of the poverty of 'such person, or otherwise, it is reasonable to do so.' The Grand Committee was strongly urged by several members of Parliament to strike out the words between the inverted commas. Instances might be multiplied to any extent to

prove that the functions of the State are no longer limited to doing necessary work which would without its intervention be left undone, and to making payments on behalf of those who cannot pay for themselves. Experience is supposed to show that the State conducts a very large class of functions far better than they could be conducted by voluntary agency, and these functions are constantly growing in number.

The Socialists point triumphantly to the undoubtedly long list of functions now performed directly by the community.

'Step by step,' they tell us, 'the political power and political organisation of the country have been used for industrial ends, until to-day the largest employer of labour is one of the Ministers of the Crown (the Postmaster-General); and almost every conceivable trade is, somewhere or other, carried on by parish, municipality, or the National Government itself without the intervention of any middleman or capitalist. The theorists who denounce the taking into its own hands of the organisation of its own labour as a thing economically unclean, repugnant to the sturdy independence of Englishmen, and as yet outside the sphere of practical politics, seldom have the least suspicion of the extent to which it has already been carried. Besides our international relations and the army, navy, police, and courts of justice, the community now carries on for itself, in some part or another of these islands, the post office, telegraphs, carriage of small commodities, coinage, currency, provision of weights and measures, the making, sweeping, lighting, and repairing of streets, roads, and bridges, life insurance, the grant of annuities, shipbuilding, stockbroking, banking, farming, and money lending, &c. It furnishes and maintains its own museums, parks, art galleries, libraries, concert halls, markets, public baths, harbours, gasworks, waterworks, tramways, allotments, artisans' dwellings, &c. &c. . . . Every one of these functions were at one time left to private enterprise, and were a source of legitimate individual investment of capital. Step by step the community has absorbed them, wholly or partially, and the area of private exploitation has been lessened.'

Besides its direct supersession of private enterprise, the State registers and controls many of the industrial functions it has not yet absorbed, and our Socialist points to barristers, solicitors, doctors, bankers, cabmen, captains, keepers of refreshment houses, and a long list of others, who require State authority to carry on their business, and whose business is more or less under the direction of the State.*

* Essay on 'The Basis of Socialism,' by Sidney Webb, LL.B. (Fabian Essays.)

The writers of 'Fabian Essays in Socialism' claim fairly enough that the trend of things towards an era of absolute Socialism is seen in the changed attitude of men towards State interference and control. They frankly remind us, however, that State control does not imply Socialism. 'Socialism is the common holding of the means of produc-'tion and exchange, *and the holding of them for the equal* '*benefit of all.*' It is upon this principle that men's politics are in truth divided. In the present Parliament, for instance, were Home Rule left out, it is absurd to pretend that the 'political parties consist of two bodies of men 'differentiated from each other by the holding of funda-'mentally different principles.' 'The Whig' has by no means disappeared, 'the daily democratic shouting of the Radical 'newspapers' to the contrary notwithstanding. It is the Tory who has gone from amongst us, and left the arena to be contested between men whose opinions are Whig and men whose opinions are Socialist. English statesmen must indeed be blind if they do not clearly see

'that every additional vote cast for avowed Socialist candidates at municipal and other elections will help to bring home to the minds of the Liberals that the section of the new democracy which regards the ballot merely as a war engine with which to attack capitalism is a growing one. At last our Liberal will be face to face with a logical but irritating choice: either to throw over private capital, or to frankly acknowledge that it is a distinction without a difference which separates him from the Conservatives, against whom he has for years been fulminating.'

So speak the Fabians.* For the time being they recognise the weakness of outspoken Socialism, but the Socialists are a growing party, and one of these days they will feel strong enough to stand alone. When that day comes they foresee, though they do not shrink from, 'the 'denunciations of Radical wirepullers and the now so com-'plaisant and courteous Radical press. The alliance will be 'at an end.' All this they are prepared to face rather than to swallow some possible Radical programme which is not truly Socialistic. The split is inevitable, and it will lead to the formation of 'a definitively Socialist party—i.e. a 'party pledged to the communalisation of all the means of 'production and exchange, and which is prepared to 'subordinate every other consideration to that end.'

* Fabian Essays in Socialism: 'The Outlook,' by Mr. Hubert Bland.

Men who are not Fabians recognise as clearly as the Fabians themselves the unstable equilibrium of the party which is supposed to be led by Mr. Gladstone, and which advocates Repeal of the Union. That party is already half ashamed of its central principle. It prefers, where it can, to engage its opponents on any other ground than that of Home Rule. To Socialistic pledges the Gladstonian candidate looks for success, regardless of the time when their fulfilment will be called for, when these very pledges 'will come home 'to roost.' Five years ago Mr. Gladstone and his friends eagerly predicted the disruption of the Unionist party. The years that have elapsed have, however, shown that the two branches of the Unionist party can work heartily and loyally together to secure good government and progressive legislation. Lord Salisbury's Government, cordially supported by Lord Hartington and a vast body of Liberal opinion throughout the country, has indubitably been the most successful Government of modern times. Whilst, on the other hand, the past five years have served to show that there is no tendency on the part of the loose fragments of the Opposition to consolidate round some central principle into a homogeneous party. It is not numbers alone that will enable a party to achieve success.

Since Mr. Gladstone shattered the Liberal party by adopting the politics of Mr. Parnell, it has been rendered abundantly clear that on other than Irish subjects he and his remaining colleagues have lost the power to guide those who sit behind them. In plain truth, Mr. Gladstone has given up the attempt, and has thrown down the reins. Party names, the names of prominent statesmen, political phrases and catchwords, have doubtless great weight. Yet something more either than names or sounding phrases is required. Without a principle which can be avowed and explained, and without a leader to point the way, no opposition can achieve a lasting success.

*No. CCCLVI. will be published in October.*

THE

# EDINBURGH REVIEW,

OCTOBER, 1891.

No. CCCLXVIII.

ART. I.—*Private Correspondence of Sir Robert Peel*, 1788–1827. Edited by CHARLES STUART PARKER, M.P. London: 1891.

THERE is probably no other English public man of the present century whose career has attracted in so large a measure the interest both of politicians and of men of letters as Sir Robert Peel. In addition to a crowd of industrious but not very distinguished compilers, it has been discussed with great skill by Guizot, by Lord Dalling, by Mr. Goldwin Smith, and by Mr. Spencer Walpole; and in that great literature of monographs which has grown up with such remarkable rapidity in England within the last decade, no less than three have been devoted to the life of Peel. The interest that attaches to him is, indeed, of a very peculiar character. He was almost wholly destitute of the power of imagination that is so conspicuous in the careers or speeches of Chatham and Burke, of Canning and Beaconsfield. Except during a few years that followed the Reform Bill of 1832, he never exhibited the spectacle of a leader struggling successfully against enormous odds. He was not one of those statesmen who see further than their contemporaries, and who, after years of failure and struggle, are proved by their ultimate triumph to have most truly read the tendencies of their age. Though he was three times Prime Minister of England, and though he was for a time deemed the most brilliant of party leaders, he left the great and powerful party which trusted him almost hopelessly shattered. Twice in his life he carried measures of transcendent importance which he had not only persistently

opposed, but had been specially placed in power for the purpose of resisting. The most striking incidents in his career are incidents of failure rather than of success, and history has pronounced that, on the most important questions of his time, he was disastrously wrong. The long delay in the inevitable emancipation of the Catholics, which was largely due to him, and the circumstances under which he ultimately carried the measure, produced evils that are in full activity at the present hour. His persistent opposition to parliamentary reform contributed to bring England to the very verge of revolution; though when the Reform Bill had been carried he nobly retrieved his error by the frankness with which he accepted, and the skill with which he used, the new conditions of English politics. His abolition of the Corn Laws at the head of a government which had been pledged to maintain them gave a great shock to public confidence, and for a long period most seriously dislocated the machinery of party government. But, in spite of all this, there are few statesmen who have carried so large a number of measures of great and acknowledged importance, who have impressed so deeply the sense of their superiority on the minds of their contemporaries, or who were followed to the grave by a more widespread and genuine regret.

It is this contrast between the leading incidents of Peel's life and the impression which he made on the world that constitutes the great interest of his career. The explanation is not difficult to discover. It is the common story of extraordinary qualities balanced by striking defects. He was not a great statesman, but he was a supremely great administrator, a supremely great master of parliamentary management and of parliamentary legislation. He had little prescience; he often grossly misread the signs of the times, or only recognised them when it was too late; but when he was once convinced, he acted on his conviction with frankness and courage, and when a thing had to be done, no one could do it like him. As Disraeli said: 'In the 'course of time the method which was natural to Sir Robert 'Peel matured into a habit of such expertness that no one 'in the despatch of affairs ever adapted the means more fitly 'to the end.'* In the words of Sir Cornewall Lewis: 'For 'concocting, producing, explaining, and defending measures, 'he had no equal, or anything like an equal.'†

* Life of Lord G. Bentinck, p. 304.
† Lewis's 'Letters,' p. 226.

In the interesting volumes which were published by Lord Mahon and Mr. Cardwell in 1856 we have Peel's own explanation of his conduct relating to the removal of the Catholic disabilities in 1829, and to the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846; but the publication of his confidential correspondence has been long delayed, and the volume before us only carries the work down to 1827. It has been edited by Mr. Parker with great care and accuracy, and with undeviating good sense and good taste, and it throws much curious light upon a corner of history which has been but little explored.

Peel started in life with great advantages. The eldest son of a very wealthy manufacturer who had long occupied a respectable place in Parliament, and who was closely attached to the dominant party in the State, he was from his earliest youth destined by his father to be a statesman. Under such circumstances he was certain in the pre-Reform period to have not only all the advantages which the best school and university education could give, but also the still greater advantages of an early introduction into both parliamentary and official life; provided always that no aberration of character, or taste, or imagination, or opinion drew him aside from the plain path that lay before him. He grew up in an atmosphere of the best middle-class virtues. Decorum, good sense, industry, strict morality; a sober religious orthodoxy; much simplicity of life, preserved in the midst of great wealth; ideals which, if not very lofty, were at least eminently practical and perfectly honourable, prevailed around him, and their influence imbued his whole nature. He accepted cordially the destiny that was before him, and threw himself into it with untiring industry. His opinions changed during his life much more than his character, and the shy, sensitive, industrious, somewhat self-conscious, somewhat awkward Harrow boy, prefigured very faithfully the future statesman. He is described as wandering when a schoolboy by himself among the hedges, knocking down birds with stones, a practice in which he was very skilful, and which eventually developed into a strong passion for shooting. He was quiet, good-natured, studious, scarcely ever in scrapes, and it was not until the last year of his school life that he threw himself with any keenness into the amusements of his comrades. He had good natural abilities; but probably the one point in which he greatly exceeded the average of intelligent boys was his memory, which was of extraordinary retentiveness, and

which he carefully cultivated. During a few months which elapsed between leaving Harrow and going to Oxford he constantly attended the House of Commons, under the Gallery; and he also attended some natural history lectures at the Royal Institution. His Oxford career was very successful. He is said to have worked before his degree examination for no less than eighteen hours, through the day and night. He gained a double-first, and in the first class of mathematics he stood alone. Such a success at once stamped him as a youth of extraordinary promise, and the impression it made was especially great because, the examination system having been very recently reorganised, he was the first Oxford man who had attained it.

He was brought into Parliament in April, 1809, almost immediately after he came of age, for the borough of Cashel. No special significance attaches to the fact of his having entered Parliament for an Irish constituency, for his father had simply bought the seat, and the young member appears to have never gone over to his constituents or held any communication with them.

'When I sat for Cashel,' he afterwards wrote, 'and was 'not in office, having made those sacrifices which could then 'legally be made, but now cannot, I did not consider myself 'at all pledged to the support of Government.' (P. 24.) Perceval, who represented in its extreme form the Tory reaction that followed the Revolution, was then Prime Minister, and Peel at once took his place among his followers. He first spoke in seconding the address in 1810, and in the partial judgement of his father his speech was considered, 'by men the best qualified to form a correct 'opinion of public speaking, the best first speech since that 'of Mr. Pitt.' (P. 27.)

It was not, perhaps, an unmixed advantage to Peel that while he was still a mere boy his father had somewhat ostentatiously destined him to be one day a Tory statesman. Such an education could hardly fail to strengthen the self-consciousness which was never wanting in Peel's character, and to give a decided bias to his judgement. At the same time, the distinctive merits of his career would have probably never been fully developed without the early administrative training which his opinions made possible for him, and there is nothing in his early history to give the least countenance to the belief that his adherence to the extreme type of Tory politics imposed the slightest strain upon his judgement. His immediate interests and his sentiments appear at this

time to have perfectly concurred. He came into Parliament with the party which was dominant, and with the section of the party which was most poor in able men: Had he adopted on the Catholic question the liberal opinions of Canning and Castlereagh, he must have held a position altogether subordinate to them; and the same causes that in the preceding ministry had raised Perceval to be leader of the House of Commons over the heads of Castlereagh and Canning, marked out for Peel the future leadership of the party of resistance to concession. It has been said, on the authority of Sir Lawrence Peel, that his first appointment was that of private secretary to Lord Liverpool, but Mr. Parker has found no trace of this in the papers either of Peel or of Lord Liverpool. In 1810, however, when he was but just twenty-two, he entered administrative life as Under-Secretary of State for War and the Colonies, and he held that place till August, 1812, when he obtained the far more important post of Chief Secretary for Ireland, and became for the next six years virtual governor of that country.

It was a post requiring not only great administrative skill, but also great gifts of original statesmanship. During the last five years of the eighteenth century, and especially during the rebellion of 1798, religious passions in Ireland, which had for more than a generation been steadily subsiding, had been kindled into a flame, and the urgent necessity of settling the Catholic question had begun to press with irresistible force on the minds of the more intelligent statesmen. Pitt had intended to complete the Union by measures for admitting Catholics into Parliament, for commuting tithes, and for paying the Catholic clergy. Through the instrumentality of Lord Castlereagh assurances of the disposition of the Cabinet had been conveyed to the Catholic bishops and the leading Catholic laymen in 1799, which were sufficient to secure their active support for the Union and to prevent any serious opposition among the Catholic laity. The bishops met the wishes of the English Government by drawing up a series of resolutions, in which they declared their readiness to accept with gratitude an endowment for the priesthood, to confer upon the English Government a power of veto over the appointment of Catholic bishops which would prevent the introduction into that body of any disloyal men, and to certify to the Government the nomination of all Catholic parish priests, as well as the fact that they had taken the oath of allegiance. But the king had not been informed of the negotiations that had taken place,

and it is well known how his uncompromising opposition produced the resignation of Pitt in 1801, how the agitation caused by the question threw the king into a temporary fit of insanity, and how Pitt at once promised that he would not move the question again during the reign. In the spring of 1804 Pitt resumed office, on the express understanding that he would not permit Catholic Emancipation; when the question was introduced in 1805 by Lord Grenville in the Lords, and by Fox in the Commons, it was defeated in both Houses by immense majorities, and Pitt declared that though he was still of opinion that there was no danger in the concession, yet, as long as the circumstances which prevented him from bringing it forward continued, he would be no party to agitating the question.

In 1806 Pitt died, and Fox and Grenville were themselves in power, but the Catholics were again disappointed. The prejudice of the king, the feeling of the country, the recent vote of the House of Commons, the presence of Lord Sidmouth in the Ministry, proved insuperable obstacles, and Fox could only urge the Catholic leaders to postpone the question. Fox died in September 1806, and the Government presided over by Lord Grenville met a new Parliament in the following December. Grenville had been Pitt's colleague during the negotiations with the Catholics that preceded the Union; he had strongly urged upon Pitt the necessity of resigning in 1801, and he never forgave him for having so lightly abandoned the cause. Grenville did not attempt to carry Emancipation, but he resolved to take at least one serious step in the direction of concession, by throwing open to the Catholics all the posts in the army and navy. An Irish Act of 1793 had enabled them to hold in Ireland commissions in the army, and to attain any rank except commander-in-chief, master-general of the ordnance, and general of the staff; but if the regiments in which they served were sent to England, they were disqualified by law from remaining in the service. The original Bill of Grenville's Government was intended to remove this anomaly, and assimilate the law in the two countries; but in the course of the discussions it was agreed that the Catholics should be freed from the exceptions to which they were subjected by the Irish Act, that all posts in the army and navy should be thrown open to men of all religious persuasions, subject only to the obligation of taking an oath which was prescribed, and that Catholic soldiers should be guaranteed by law the free exercise of their religion. The king had

been informed of this, and was understood to have given a distinct, though a reluctant, assent; but a strong Protestant party, headed by Perceval, fiercely opposed it. The king withdrew his assent from the added clauses, and expressed his disapprobation of the whole measure. At last, after much discussion, the ministers agreed for the present to withdraw their Bill, reserving to themselves by a Cabinet minute, which was submitted to the king, the right to renew it, or to propose any other measure on the subject which they desired. But the king was determined to push his victory to the end. He demanded from his ministers a promise in writing that they would never again propose to him any measure connected with Catholic Emancipation, and as the ministers refused to give this unconstitutional pledge, the king dismissed them from office, and called the Duke of Portland to the head of affairs.

It was the second time that the king had broken up a ministry on the Catholic question, and his conduct was especially significant, as his refusal to grant military promotion to Catholics was announced in the midst of a great war, and at a time when thousands of Catholics were fighting in his armies. It at once appeared that there were two entirely distinct schools of Tories. Pitt, to the very close of his life, had declared that his opinions on the Catholic question were unchanged, though he would not force them against the inclination of the king; and his views were adopted by Canning, Castlereagh, and Wellesley. Perceval, on the other hand, emphatically declared that he 'could not conceive a time or any change of circumstances which could render further concession to the Catholics consistent with the safety of the State.'* With the exception of Eldon, scarcely any man of real ability adopted this view until Peel entered Parliament as the follower of Perceval. It is sufficiently evident from this fact how little truth there is in the theory that attributes Peel's early Toryism to a blind admiration for Pitt.

The party of the king triumphed. Parliament was dissolved on the 'No Popery' cry, and on the first great party division that followed the election the ministers in the House of Commons had a majority of 195. Canning and Castlereagh, though they had no sympathy with that cry, availed themselves of the current that ran so strongly against the Whigs. In the ministry of the Duke of Port-

* Hansard, First Ser. xxi. 663.

land they held the seals for the Foreign and War Departments, but the leadership of the Commons and the virtual leadership of the ministry was given to Perceval, who, though entirely without brilliant parts, exhibited unexpected talents, both as a practical debater and as a manager of men, and who had the advantage of representing fully the dominant party. Several circumstances, however, other than a conviction of the danger of the Catholic claims, contributed to the triumph of the anti-Catholic party. The Whigs, already broken by their policy towards France in the first stages of the Revolution and of the war, had become still more unpopular through their opposition to the seizure of the Danish fleet and to the Peninsular War. They were divided among themselves, for there was little sympathy between the more aristocratic Whigs, who were represented by Grenville and Lord Howick, and the more Radical party of Sir F. Burdett and Whitbread. A strong personal as well as political dislike already existed between Howick and Canning, and prevented their hearty co-operation on the one great question on which they were agreed. Above all, there was a general conviction among statesmen that the king's mind was trembling on the verge of insanity, and that a renewal of the Catholic complications of 1801 would produce a catastrophe.

The question was debated in both the Lords and Commons in 1808. In the former it was lost by a majority of 87, and in the latter by a majority of 153. Grattan on this occasion introduced the Catholic petition in a speech of consummate power; but both Castlereagh and Canning opposed the reception of the petition, on the ground that the time was unsuited for the agitation of the question; and the spirit of the ruling part of the ministry was sufficiently shown by the reduction of the Maynooth grant from 13,000*l.* to 9,250*l.* When the Portland Government was broken up in September, 1809, by the quarrel, duel, and resignation of Canning and Castlereagh, Perceval became the head of the new ministry, Lord Wellesley occupying the place of Canning, and Lord Hawkesbury that of Castlereagh; and an intensely anti-Catholic ministry continued to the death of Perceval. In 1809 the Catholic question was not introduced into Parliament. In the spring of 1810 it was introduced into both Houses, but was defeated by majorities of 86 and 104; but in October 1810 an event occurred which profoundly changed the aspect of affairs. The king's insanity broke out anew in a form which gave

little hope of recovery, and the Prince of Wales was appointed regent. For a year the regency was subject to restrictions similar to those which had been adopted in 1788, but on February 1, 1812, these restrictions were to cease, and the Regent was to enter into full fruition of the royal power.

The hopes of the Catholics were now raised to the highest point. With the confirmed insanity of George III. the most serious of all the obstacles to their claims was removed. During the year of the restricted regency, while there was still some chance of the recovery of the king, the Prince of Wales declined to remove the existing ministry from office, though even this decision was not taken without some hesitation and some negotiations with the Whigs. The Catholics, however, fully expected that the royal influence would now be exerted in their favour, and that the Whig ministry would speedily come. The Prince of Wales had long been in close connexion with the Whigs. As early as 1797 he had expressed a desire to go over to Ireland as Lord-Lieutenant, carrying with him a policy of conciliation to the Catholics. In 1805, when Fox and Grenville had introduced the Catholic question into the Imperial Parliament, the Prince, while stating that considerations of obvious delicacy prevented him from taking an immediate and open part in its favour, had given the Whig leaders the fullest authority to assure the Catholics of Ireland that he would never forsake their interests, the 'most distinct and authentic pledge' of his wish to relieve them from the disabilities of which they complained, and to exert himself in their favour as soon as he was constitutionally able to do so. It is easy, therefore, to imagine the consternation and the indignation with which, in 1812, the Catholics found that the Prince Regent had changed his principles and his policy; that, after a short and perhaps insincere negotiation with the Whigs, he had resolved to maintain in power a ministry which was constructed for the main purpose of maintaining the Catholic disabilities; and that his own opinions were rapidly verging towards this policy.

The situation in Ireland was becoming very dangerous. For some years after the Union a great apathy prevailed, and there is no reasonable doubt that, if events in England had been favourable, Catholic Emancipation would have met with no serious opposition in Ireland, and could have been carried with every reasonable limitation and safeguard. The most competent English officials calculated that at least sixty-four of the 100 Irish representatives would vote for it, and that

a decided preponderance of Irish Protestant opinion was in its favour. On the other hand, the Catholic bishops and aristocracy had fully accepted the policy of an endowment for the priests and a veto on the appointment of bishops, and the most Conservative elements in the Catholic body still exercised an ascendency over their co-religionists. The question of the veto had been mentioned in the Commons, by Sir J. Hippisley, in 1805, and in 1808 Grattan and Ponsonby formally announced, on the authority of the Catholic bishops, their readiness to accept it. A letter from Bishop Milner was read to the House, which very clearly stated their position:—

'The Catholic prelates of Ireland,' he wrote, 'are willing to give a direct negative power to his Majesty's Government with respect to the nomination of their titular bishoprics, in such manner that when they have among themselves resolved who is the fittest person for the vacant see, they will transmit his name to his Majesty's ministers; and if the latter should object to that name, they will transmit another and another, until a name is presented to which no objection is made; and (which is never likely to be the case) should the Pope refuse to give those essentially necessary spiritual powers, of which he is the depository, to the person so presented by the Catholic bishops and so approved by the Government, they will continue to propose names till one occurs which is agreeable to both parties—namely, the Crown and Apostolic See.'

The prelates also engaged to nominate no persons who had not previously taken the oath of allegiance.* But a democratic party had now arisen among the Catholics, which utterly repudiated the restrictions of the veto, which sought emancipation by violent and democratic agitation, and which was rapidly drawing the most dangerous elements in the country into its channel. The bishops, pushed on by the strong force that was behind them, speedily retraced their steps, and passed resolutions against the restrictions they had accepted, and there were evident signs that the Catholic body was passing away from the guidance of Grattan and of the gentry. This was not surprising in a country where many elements of anarchy subsisted; and the democratic party had already found in O'Connell a leader of consummate skill, and of untiring industry, energy, and ambition. But the chief cause of the great change that was passing over the Irish Catholics was to be found in the disappointment of their hopes in 1801, in 1804, in 1806, and 1812; in the

* Butler's 'Hist. Memoirs,' ii. 177.

desertion of their cause by Pitt; in the proved impotence of the Whigs; in the failure of 'the securities' even to mitigate the hostility of Perceval and his followers; in the profound consternation and exasperation that were produced by the attitude of the Regent. The formation of the General Committee of Catholic Delegates was speedily followed by its suppression under the Convention Act. But the influence of O'Connell was rapidly growing; there were already ominous signs of a possible agitation for the repeal of the Union, and the indignation of the Catholics was significantly shown by the famous 'witchery resolutions,' which were unanimously carried by the aggregate meeting of the Catholics in the June of 1812, reflecting on the influence which Lady Hertford was believed to exercise over the Prince. After calling for the 'total and unqualified repeal of the penal 'laws which aggrieve the Catholics,' they proceeded to use the following language: 'That from authentic documents 'now before us we hear, with deep disappointment and 'anguish, how cruelly the promised boon of Catholic freedom 'has been interrupted by the fatal witchery of an unworthy 'secret influence. . . . To this impure source we trace but too 'distinctly our baffled hopes and protracted servitude.' Such language was not calculated to conciliate the Prince, and he was only confirmed in his hostility to the Catholics. As early as September, 1813, the Duke of Richmond wrote to Peel: 'I was delighted to find H.R.H. as steady a Protestant 'as the Attorney-General.' (P. 107.)

The commencement, however, of what was virtually a new reign had given a new activity to the question. It was brought forward in different forms in the first months of 1812 by Lord Wellesley and Lord Donoughmore in one House, and by Lord Morpeth and Grattan in the other; and although it was still defeated, the diminished majorities, the evident signs of an increased Catholic party in the country, and the language of some of the most distinguished men in Parliament, clearly indicated the progress of the measure. Canning especially now strenuously urged that the time had come when the Catholic question must be fully dealt with. The assassination of Perceval on May 11, 1812, again changed the situation, and led to a long series of feeble and abortive negotiations. An attempt was made to continue the existing ministry under the lead of Lord Liverpool, with the addition of Canning and Lord Wellesley; but these statesmen declined the offer, on the ground that the other ministers refused to carry Catholic emancipation, and Lord Wellesley

on the additional ground of their languor in prosecuting the Spanish war. The Regent then authorised Lord Wellesley to construct a ministry, with the assistance of Canning, and an offer was made to Lords Grey and Grenville to join it, promising an immediate consideration of the Catholic claims with a view to a conciliatory settlement; while, on the other hand, attempts were made to retain the services of the leading members of Perceval's ministry. But the Whig leaders refused to take part in a coalition ministry, in which they would probably be outvoted, and the former Cabinet was reconstructed, under the leadership of Lord Liverpool, but on the principle of leaving the Catholic question an open one. Liverpool himself was opposed to concession, but his opposition was by no means of the unqualified kind which had been shown by Perceval; and a large proportion of his colleagues, including Castlereagh, who led the House of Commons, were in favour of Catholic emancipation. If Canning had consented to join the ministry, Lord Wellesley would probably have been Lord-Lieutenant in Ireland, and under these circumstances the Catholic side could scarcely have failed to acquire a decisive preponderance. If, on the other hand, Castlereagh had followed the example of Canning, and refused to take part in a ministry which declined to settle the Catholic question, or if the Whigs had consented to co-operate with Canning, the settlement of this great question could scarcely have been deferred. Unfortunately, none of these things happened. Castlereagh remained the leader of the House. Canning refused to follow his leadership, and two years later accepted the embassy to Lisbon. The Whig leaders stood aloof from all ministerial combinations. The Duke of Richmond, who was violently anti-Catholic, continued to be Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland; the post of Chief Secretary was given to Peel, and Ireland was destined to undergo fifteen more years of demoralising and disorganising agitation before the Catholic question was settled.

Canning, however, as an independent member, brought forward a resolution pledging the House to an early consideration of the laws affecting his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, with a view to their final conciliatory adjustment, and the conditions of the question had so profoundly changed that it was carried by a majority of 129; while a similar motion by Lord Wellesley in the House of Lords was met by the previous question, which was carried by a majority of only one.

Peel, though he had come into Parliament as a special follower of Perceval, had not yet pledged himself decisively against the Catholics. He had voted silently against Canning's motion in June, and although he had spoken against a previous motion of Grattan, he had done so mainly on the ground that the time was not opportune, and had expressly guarded himself against giving any positive pledge. He was now, however, obliged to take a more prominent part, and for the next six years he was the chief support of the anti-Catholic party in Parliament. His part was a very difficult one, for he had to encounter Grattan, Plunket, Canning, and the Whig leaders, and he had scarcely any real supporters. Saurin, the Attorney-General, it is true, was strongly opposed to all concession. He was a lawyer of high character and attainments, of Huguenot descent and strong Huguenot principles, and he had borne a distinguished part in opposition to the Union; but Saurin refused to go to London. Bushe, who was Solicitor-General, leaned to the Catholic side; and, to the great indignation and consternation of the Government, Wellesley Pole, who had preceded Peel as Chief Secretary, and who was the brother of Lord Wellesley, now pronounced himself strongly in Parliament in favour of the Catholics. This speech was entirely unexpected, for Pole had hitherto been regarded as a staunch adherent of the Protestant party, and as late as the last day of 1811 he had sent a memorandum on the Catholic question to the Secretary of State in England, which was intended to be laid before the Cabinet, and which maintained the impossibility of safely satisfying the Catholic claims, and the expediency of the Prince Regent's taking a decided part against them. A general election had taken place in September, and it is evident from the letters of Lord Liverpool and Peel that they at this time looked upon Canning and his followers with even more hostility than the regular Opposition.

In the new Parliament the Catholic question at once assumed a great prominence. A motion for the immediate consideration of the laws affecting the Catholics was introduced by Grattan, supported by Castlereagh, opposed by Peel, and ultimately carried by a majority of 40. A resolution of Grattan's for removing laws imposing civil and military disabilities on the Catholics, with such regulations and exceptions as might provide for the security of the Protestant succession and of the Established Church, was

next introduced. Peel opposed it bitterly, but was beaten by a majority of 67.

'We were terribly beaten,' he wrote to his Under-Secretary, 'but we are sad cowards, I am afraid; at least, we are shamefully used. Poor Duigenan could not get a hearing, and the general impression seemed against the Protestants. We will fight them out, however, to the last. I am sure it is better than to give way.' 'Your defence of the Protestant cause,' wrote Saurin, 'was not only by far the ablest and best, but the only one which did not seem to strengthen the cause of the adversary by some concession of principle. I really fear the Protestant cause is lost in the Commons. There can be no rally now but on the securities.' (P. 80.)

Grattan at once brought in a Bill in accordance with the terms of the Resolution that had been carried; but the Protestant party now rallied around a motion of Sir John Hippisley, for a committee to enquire into the state and tenets of the Roman Catholics, and the laws affecting them. Canning pointed out with great force that a committee of enquiry was exactly what the Protestant party had for so many years strenuously resisted; but, as Peel wrote to the Duke of Richmond, there was no inconsistency in their conduct :—

'When the question was whether we should consider the claims of the Catholics and the laws affecting them, or should resist their claims, we voted for resistance without inquiry; the question now is, whether we shall consider or concede, and we prefer inquiry to concession.' (P. 83.)

The motion for delay, however, was defeated by 187 to 235, and the second reading of Grattan's Bill was carried by 245 to 203. But a sudden change now occurred in the prospects of the cause. Canning and Castlereagh, with the full assent of Grattan, introduced clauses for the securities which had been before intimated, giving the Crown a control over the nomination of the Catholic bishops. But the bishops unanimously condemned the proposal, and the large majority of the Catholic Board supported them. It became evident that the Bill before Parliament would fail to satisfy the Catholics, and after a long discussion the clause admitting Catholics to Parliament was rejected by 251 to 247.

Peel had triumphed. The profound division which had broken out among the supporters of Catholic Emancipation threw back for many years a cause which had been almost gained, though in 1817 an Act was passed without opposition throwing open to the Catholics the military and naval

positions which Grenville had vainly attempted to open in 1807. Few things could have been eventually more disastrous both to Ireland and to the Empire than the defeat of the influence represented by Grattan and by the Catholic gentry, and the growing ascendency of O'Connell and the democratic and sacerdotal party in Irish popular politics. Grattan had long predicted that, if concession was not speedily and wisely made, population in Ireland would drift away from the guiding and moderating influence of property; that seditious and anarchical men would gain an ascendency which would make the whole problem of Irish government incalculably difficult; that a priesthood unconnected with the English Government would lead to a 'Catholic laity 'discorporated from the people of England.' In the Irish Parliament, the strong bias of Conservatism in his policy had been repeatedly displayed, and it was equally apparent in the Imperial Parliament. In 1807 he had supported the Insurrection Act, in opposition to many of his friends, on the ground that there was a real and dangerous French party in Ireland, which the common law was insufficient to suppress. In 1814 he expressed his full approval of the proclamation suppressing the Catholic Board. He steadily and earnestly maintained that, although it was vitally necessary that Catholic Emancipation should be speedily carried, it should be accompanied by measures for securing, as far as possible, the loyalty of the higher Catholic clergy, and uniting them in interest and sentiment with the British Government. He looked with bitter hostility on the rise and policy of O'Connell. He accused him of 'setting afloat the 'bad passions of the people,' making grievances instruments of power without any honest wish to redress them, treating politics as a trade to serve a desperate and interested purpose.

But the influence of Grattan was now manifestly declining, and Peel watched the decline with a short-sighted and not very generous pleasure. In Parliament, though numbers were against the Catholics, the overwhelming preponderance of ability was still in favour of the principle of Emancipation, and it was in leading the anti-Catholic party that Peel chiefly acquired his almost unrivalled parliamentary skill. He had, indeed, all the qualities of a great debater: courage, fluency, self-possession, complete command of every subject he treated, unfailing lucidity both in statement and reasoning; admirable skill in marshalling and disentangling great masses of facts, in meeting, evading, or retorting arguments, and detecting the weak points of the case of an

opponent, in veiling, by plausible language, extreme or unpalatable views, in extricating himself by subtle distinctions and qualifications from embarrassing situations. He can scarcely, it is true, be called a great orator. His style was formal, cumbrous, extremely verbose, without sparkle and without fire. He had little or no power of moving the passions, nothing of the flexibility that can adapt itself to very different audiences, nothing of the philosophic insight that can impart a perennial interest to transient discussions. But few men have ever understood the House of Commons like him, or have possessed in so high a degree the qualities that are most fitted to command and influence it. The great mass of anti-Catholic sentiment in the country rallied around him as its most powerful champion, and in 1817 he attained one of the chief objects of his ambition in being elected member for Oxford University. It is well known that his older and more brilliant rival had long aspired to this honour. It was mainly through the Catholic question that Canning missed and Peel won the prize.

The nickname 'Orange Peel,' which was given to him in Ireland, was not wholly deserved. His letters abundantly show that he had no sympathy with the ribbons, the anniversaries, the party tunes, the insulting processions and insulting language of the Orangemen; and, although he believed that in Ireland anti-Catholicism and loyalty were very closely connected, he viewed with much dislike the growth of any political confederacies unconnected with the Government. Declamation and boastfulness and needless provocation were, indeed, wholly alien to his nature; and even when defending extreme causes he rarely or never used the language of a fanatic. He resisted Catholic concession mainly on the ground that the admission of the Catholics to political power would prove incompatible with the existence of the Established Church in Ireland, with the security of property in a country where property was mainly in Protestant hands, and ultimately with the connexion between the two countries. His arguments were not based on religion, but on political expediency; but it was an expediency which he believed to be permanent.

'I see,' he wrote to the Duke of Richmond, 'one of the papers reports me as having said that I was not an advocate for perpetual exclusion. It might be inferred that I objected only to the time of discussing the question. That is not the case. . . . There are certain anomalies in the system which I would wish to remove, but the main principles of it I would retain untouched. . . . At no time, and under

no circumstances, so long as the Catholic admits the supremacy in spirituals of a foreign earthly potentate, and will not tell us what supremacy in spirituals means—so long as he will not give us voluntarily the security which every despotic sovereign in Europe has by the concession of the Pope himself—will I consent to admit them.' (P. 76.)

The letters before us show clearly that his political sympathy was with Saurin, with Duigenan, with Lord Eldon, and even with Lord Norbury. O'Connell early perceived in Peel his most dangerous opponent, and a strong personal enmity, which was as much due to profound differences of character as to differences of policy, grew up between them. A scurrilous attack of O'Connell on Peel in 1815 was followed by a challenge, and a duel was prevented only by the arrest of O'Connell. The antipathy between the two men was never mitigated. O'Connell said of Peel that 'his smile was like the silver plate on a coffin.' Peel, in his confidential letters, expressed the utmost dislike and contempt for the character of O'Connell, and when he was at length compelled by the Clare election to concede Catholic Emancipation, his feeling towards him was significantly and characteristically shown. He enumerated in a brilliant passage the men to whom the triumph of Catholic Emancipation was really due. He spoke of Fox and Grattan, of Plunket and of Canning, but he made no mention of O'Connell.

The administrative side of Peel's Chief Secretaryship is much more creditable to him than the political side. The vivid picture which his letters present of the manner in which Ireland was governed more than fifteen years after the Union will probably strike the reader with some surprise, when he remembers that the Union had extinguished about seventy small boroughs, and had at the same time greatly diminished the importance of the Irish representatives, and therefore the necessities for corruption. Peel noticed that while 'the pension list of Great Britain was limited to '90,000*l.* per annum, the pension list of Ireland may amount 'to 80,000*l.* a year.' (P. 100.) And he found almost all Irish patronage still employed for political purposes, and almost every office honeycombed with abuses and peculations. A few extracts will give the reader some notion of the nature and extent of the evil, and of the efforts of Peel to reduce it:—

'How is it possible,' he wrote, 'to propose that a shilling should be granted to a general officer on the staff in Ireland when sixpence

is granted in England? This is called a modification in official phrase, but it ought to be called doubling the allowance. Set your face steadily against all increase of salary, all extra allowances, all plausible claims for additional emolument. Economy must be the order of the day—rigid economy.' (Pp. 217, 218.) 'When English members hear that the sheriff appoints the grand jury, that the grand jury tax the county, that the sheriff has a considerable influence at elections, and that the sheriff is appointed openly on the recommendation of the member supporting the Government, they are startled not a little. . . . I know that this is a most convenient patronage to the Government, but I know also that I cannot hint in the House of Commons at such a source of patronage, and I confess I have great doubts on the legitimacy of it. . . . After Lord Redesdale's declaration . . . that the mode of appointing sheriffs "poisons the sources of justice," and witnessing the general feeling among the English against making the nomination of a most important officer in the execution of justice dependent on the will of the county member, I thought it highly expedient to give a positive assurance that the Government would revert to the ancient and legal practice of appointing sheriffs in Ireland. . . . With a pure Bench—and time will, I hope, purify it—the change would be an essential change for the better.' (Pp. 222–224.) 'Foster says that the abuses discovered in the office [of Clerk of the Pleas] are enormous, that the amount of fees exacted from suitors is not less than 30,000*l.* per annum, of which the principal clerk did not receive more than one-third. A Mr. Pollock, the first deputy, is in receipt of 8,000*l.* or 9,000*l.* a year as his own share of the profits; other deputies and persons unnecessarily employed have profits amounting to 1,200*l.* or 1,400*l.* a year each. Foster thinks that every possible difficulty will be thrown in the way of an early decision in the Irish Courts. . . . In the meantime, the Chief Baron is receiving the enormous profits arising from these enormous abuses.' (P. 212.)

The practice of buying and selling public offices, and the practice of dividing the salaries of a single office between a principal and deputies, still continued; but Peel did his utmost to eradicate them. If it were permitted in one case, he said, 'every officer in every department who purchased 'on corrupt terms and is now living may claim a right to 'sell the office so purchased.' (P. 283.)

'With respect to a payment out of the salary to R., I can have no scruple in giving you my opinion that it would not be right. I have never been, and cannot conscientiously be, a party to an arrangement of that kind, because I think this is quite clear, that if the salary of the office is disproportionate to the labour of it, and can bear to be taxed to the amount of 200*l.*, the public should benefit, and the emoluments of the office be reduced.' (P. 284.)

One of Peel's first tasks was to conduct a general election, and he had ample opportunities of judging how these

things were managed in Ireland. A law, known as Curwen's Act, had been recently passed, condemning to a heavy fine in the event of failure, and to the loss of his seat in the event of success, any person giving, or promising to give, or consenting to give, either money or office for a seat in Parliament. The law was not a little embarrassing to Peel, as his own seat of Cashel had been purchased, and he thought it safer to transfer himself to the English seat of Chippenham, where his return was managed by his father without any intervention on his own part. At the same time, the elections in Ireland went on much as if Curwen's Act had never passed.

'I am placed in a delicate situation enough here,' he wrote to his friend Croker: 'bound to secure the Government interests, if possible, from dilapidation, but still more bound to faint with horror at the mention of money transactions, to threaten the unfortunate culprits with impeachment if they hint at an impure return, and yet to prevent these strongholds, Cashel, Mallow, and Tralee, from surrendering to the enemies who besiege them.' (P. 47.)

Croker himself furnished an admirable illustration of the manner in which these principles were carried out.

'I find the borough' [Down], he writes, 'extremely well disposed to me. Of the respectable and steady people I have a decided majority, not less than twenty; but there are sixty-two persons who are extremely doubtful. . . . I have the greatest repugnance to bribery, . . . but my agent informs me that many voters will require money. . . . The return absolutely depends upon pounds sterling. The best computation which my agents can make is that a sum of 2,000*l.* will be necessary. The natural expenses will be 500*l.* These, I think, I am bound to make good. But with regard to the money for votes, that I expect from Government.' (P. 49.)

Peel replied that he could not answer for the Government in England, and that the Irish Government possessed no funds for this purpose; he would himself have been ready to send Croker '1,000*l.* as a private concern between 'ourselves, with no reference whatever to Government;' but he had it not. 'If you think proper,' he added, 'to take the 'chance whether it [the Government] will assist you, you 'can promise.' (Pp. 49, 50). For about six years Peel was constantly receiving from Croker requests for places, in order to discharge 'debts of gratitude' incurred at this election; and in 1816 we find the Government very nearly beaten in the House of Commons in an attempt to raise Croker's own salary.

'Could you tell me,' writes Lord Palmerston to Peel, 'whether you think there is any probability of a contest for the county of Sligo at

the next election? I could at the present moment make from 280 to 290 voters by giving leases to tenants who are now holding at will. If there is any chance of their being of use next year, I will do so forthwith, and register them in time. If not, I should perhaps postpone giving twenty-one years' leases till matters look a little more propitious to the payment of rents.' (P. 256.)

'Lord Lorton wrote yesterday to his agent to make all the freeholders he can on his small Queen's County property. He says he is sorry he can't make more than twenty, but that those shall go against Pole.' (P. 79.)

A few illustrations of the minor details of patronage may be added. One gentleman called upon Peel about an election in Clare, but

'said that he would make no promise of his interest unless he received a pledge from me that his two brothers should be provided for—one in the Church, and the other advanced in the profession of the law.'

Lord C. 'wanted, long since, to make terms with me for his support in Cork, . . . and wished to be one of a committee for superintending the patronage of the county.'

'When G. wants a baronetcy, he is very rich; and when he wants a place, he is very poor. I think we may fairly turn the tables on him, and when he asks to be a baronet, make his poverty the objection, and his wealth when he asks for an office.'

'Pole is constantly pressing K., of the Navigation Board, for promotion. . . . I am told he entirely neglects his duty. Pole readily admits his hopeless stupidity and unfitness for office.'

'I do not think your son,' Peel wrote to his Under-Secretary, 'can make a more inefficient member of the Board of Stamps than Mr. T. has done. I am perfectly ready, therefore, to acquiesce in the exchange.' 'I make a great sacrifice,' he wrote to Lord Whitworth, 'when I say that I doubt whether O.'s habits would qualify him for such practical duties as the Collector of Belfast at least ought to perform. Belfast is so flourishing a town, and contributes so much to the revenue, that I fear the Collectorship of it is too prominent a situation to place in it a young man. . . . we must admit to be a ruined man by gambling. Considering how careless he has been of his own money, perhaps some office not connected with the collection of the public money . . . would be more suited to him. . . . What do you think of the following arrangement? Make J. collector, for this very bad and very good reason, that he is the most inefficient Commissioner, and therefore the public service will suffer least from his appointment. Make Colonel H. a Commissioner. He will be about as inefficient as J. Make R. M. junior, the most inefficient of the three, Surveyor of Lands, *vice* H., which (though he will lose 200*l.* a year) will greatly oblige his father, the member; and, lastly, fulfil your good intentions towards O. by making him a Commissioner of Accounts, *vice* M.' (Pp. 271, 276–278.)

Many other characteristic pictures pass before us. There

were officers of the revenue who were recommended to 'the marked favour' of the Government because they had shown what Peel somewhat rashly called 'the common 'honesty' of refusing bribes. (P. 279.) There was an official who scandalously connived at an abuse of justice by which innocent women were condemned to transportation, though taking measures that the Government should indirectly hear of the transaction. (P. 279.) There were shameful abuses in the sale of the office of gaoler, shameful frauds in the collection of taxes, in the Customs, in the barrack charges. (Pp. 97, 98, 280–283.)

'My most decided opinion,' Peel wrote about one of these culprits, 'is in favour of his dismissal. I am quite tired of, and disgusted with, the shameful corruptions which every Irish inquiry brings to light.' (P. 282.)

Much trouble was given by newspapers which were subsidised by the Government, and at the same time conducted in a manner which no honest Government could approve of. (Pp 114–116, 211, 218.) Another evil is disclosed in the following very creditable letter written by Peel to one of his successors.

'I found in Ireland that every official man, not content with the favour of Government to himself, thought he had a right to quarter his family on the patronage of Government. I took the course that you have done in order to enable me to resist with effect such extravagant pretensions. I determined never to gratify any private wish of my own by the smallest Irish appointment. There is nothing half so disgusting as the personal monopoly of honours and offices by those to whom the distribution of them is entrusted.' (P. 60.)

In the Irish Pension List there had been enormous abuses, but Peel took credit for having effectually stopped them.

'No member of Parliament,' he wrote, 'has benefited by it. No vote has been influenced by it. . . . I do not think there are any three years in the whole period of the Irish history during which so honest a use has been made of it.' (P. 275.)

As might have been expected, blunders arising from extreme inefficiency were very numerous. In one case, by negligent drafting, the Insurrection Bill was made to extend to three instead of two years, while a simple mistake in one of the Revenue Bills was believed to have cost the Revenue not less than 40,000*l.* (P. 96.)

In all this dreary field the great administrative ability of Peel and the essential integrity of his character produced much real improvement, though it is very possible to

exaggerate his merits. No one who has read the Hardwicke and Colchester papers will question that some of his predecessors, and especially the Chancellor, Lord Redesdale, had laboured with at least equal earnestness to purify Irish administration; and the energy with which Lord Redesdale, though out of office, still recurred to the subject, was extremely displeasing to Peel. (P. 211.) His own patronage, as we have already seen, was by no means ideal, and he was very anxious to stifle parliamentary inquiries.

'I believe,' he wrote, 'an honest, despotic government 'would be by far the fittest government for Ireland'; but as this could not be attained he wished no essential alteration.

'I think the present system on which the government of Ireland is conducted is the best, but I am terribly afraid that Englishmen, who know nothing of Ireland, would not concur with me if they inquired into detail. It is very difficult to manage even the most limited inquiry. How could we prevent the introduction of tithes, magistracy, the Catholic question itself?' (Pp. 215, 219, 220.)

Whatever might be the case in the future, he believed that in the present it was impossible for the Irish Government to receive adequate support unless it made up its mind to purchase it. (Pp. 112, 113.) 'It would be good policy,' he says in one of his letters, 'to direct the channel of patronage 'as plentifully as we can towards those who are adhering to 'us on these pressing questions of army establishments and 'property tax.' (P. 273.) He refused in very lofty tones applications for peerages as rewards for political support (pp. 274, 275); but the merit of this refusal belongs mainly to Lord Liverpool, who, at the beginning of the Chief Secretaryship, took on this subject a very firm and honourable line, both in England and Ireland, and maintained it at the sacrifice of many votes. (Pp. 42, 43.) For Irish honours unaccompanied by endowments there appear to have been few applicants. (P. 164.) Peel disliked the bestowal of ecclesiastical dignities as rewards for political services (p. 163); but if he did not practise it quite as much as his predecessors, this appears to have been much more due to nature than to policy.

'There is nothing so extraordinary,' he wrote, 'in natural history as the longevity of all bishops, priests, and deacons in Ireland. During the last five years there has been literally no Church preferment to dispose of, to the infinite disappointment of many expectants.' (P. 270.)

In the higher legal appointments, however, while insisting

that 'attachment to the Government on principle' was very material, Peel cordially agreed with Saurin that it was vitally necessary to select men 'for character, and not for 'politics or connexion;' and he added, that those were not likely to be the least fit for high office who were too proud to solicit it. 'It is a species of pride which occasions 'very little practical inconvenience in Ireland.' (Pp. 164, 165.)

His letters show clearly the terrible evils of Irish life. He speaks of 'the enormous and overgrown population,' with no employment except agriculture (p. 233); of a poverty so extreme that in many districts widespread starvation was averted only by prompt government intervention (p. 245); of 'that infernal curse, the forty shilling freeholds' p. 222); of the evil system of employing the military in distraining for rent and in the collection of tithes (p. 176); of juries, through fear or sympathy, acquitting prisoners in the face of the clearest evidence (pp. 124, 125); of the gross perjury in the law courts (p. 207); of the almost universal disaffection of the lower orders, fostered by a seditious press (pp. 102, 123, 124, 211); of the growing spirit of animosity in the north of Ireland between the lower orders of Protestants and Catholics, which was breaking out in constant riots, and had already cost many lives (p. 122). This last evil, it might be truly said, was very largely due to the policy of his own party, who had protracted through so many years the Catholic question, which ought to have been settled at the Union. There was extreme and chronic ignorance, poverty, and anarchy; the payment of tithes was constantly resisted; and a failure of the potato crop, and a sudden and terrible fall in the price of agricultural products after the peace, added enormously to the difficulties of the situation. It is remarkable, indeed, that there appears to have been in 1816 and 1817 less disturbance of the public peace in Ireland than in England; Peel found it even possible to reduce the military establishments (pp. 228, 236, 257), and in Dublin extreme distress was borne with remarkable patience (p. 236); but in many parts of the country crimes of combination were frequent, and almost incredibly savage. Peel mentions one case of a family of eight persons who were deliberately burnt in their house by a party of armed men, because the owner of the house had prosecuted to conviction three men, on a capital charge, at the Louth Assizes (Pp. 231). In another case a farmer, who had shot two men who attacked his house, was himself shot dead on a Sunday morning, after mass, at the chapel door, in the

presence of hundreds of men, not one of whom attempted to arrest the culprit. (P. 121.)

These things filled Peel with a not unnatural horror, and his letters showed clearly his intense dislike both of the Irish character and of the Irish religion. (Pp. 207, 231, 235, 236.) By far the most valuable contribution he made to the improvement of Ireland during his Chief Secretaryship was the formation, in 1814, of an efficient police force, which has ever since been popularly associated with his name, and which was the nucleus from which the present admirable constabulary force was developed in 1822 and in 1835. 'We 'ought to be crucified,' he wrote, 'if we make the measure 'a job, and select our constables from the servants of our 'parliamentary friends.' (P. 152.) He attempted also, though without much success, to institute a system of popular education on a perfectly unsectarian basis, and with Catholics among the commissioners. (Pp. 87–92.) He appears to have met with little encouragement, and at least one Catholic bishop lost no time in cursing 'these nefarious 'deistical schools'; but some schools were established, and Peel has the merit of being one of the earliest advocates of a general system of unsectarian national education for Ireland, which many years after was accomplished. His measures for the relief of distress appear to have been skilful and judicious, supporting and stimulating, but not superseding, private benevolence. (Pp. 244, 265.) For the rest, he relied chiefly on Insurrection Acts strengthening the executive and giving a greater efficiency to the administration of justice, and on strong protective legislation encouraging the corn and the manufactures of Ireland.

'I have always,' he wrote, 'been, and always shall be, as strong an advocate for giving that preference to the productions of Ireland, natural or artificial, which will best promote the industry of the people, as I am for instructing the lower orders.' (Pp. 167, 233.)

To the tithe system he would do nothing, and this is one of the fatal blots on his reputation as a statesman. There was no single source of crime, agitation, and disaffection in Ireland which was so prolific as this, and there was no subject on which the wisest statesmen had been more agreed than on the supreme importance of meeting this evil by a judicious system of commutation. Pitt had clearly expressed his opinion of the necessity of such a commutation to the Duke of Rutland as early as 1786, and it was one of the measures which he intended to have followed the Union. Grattan had brought schemes of commutation in three

successive years before the Irish Parliament. Lord Loughborough, who was the chief cause of the failure of Catholic Emancipation after the Union, had himself drawn up a Tithe Commutation Bill. Lord Redesdale, who represented the extreme Toryism of the ministry of Addington, strongly urged the absolute necessity of speedy legislation on the subject. The Duke of Bedford, in 1807, dwelt on the importance of commuting tithes into a land-tax, and ultimately into land. Parnell and Grattan had brought the subject before the Imperial Parliament in 1810, and it was again and again insisted on by the Whig writers, and nowhere more strongly than in Sydney Smith's admirable letters to Peter Plymley and in some of the pages of this Journal. But nothing was done till the evil had become intolerable, and had brought the country to a state of anarchy and demoralisation that can scarcely be exaggerated. The connexion of Peel with the question of Irish tithes is a very remarkable one. The Tithe Commutation Act, which was carried by a Whig Government in 1838, is one of the few instances of perfectly successful legislation in Irish history, and it is well known that the chief credit of this measure does not belong to the ministers who carried it. It was the very measure which Sir Robert Peel had introduced in 1835, which the Whig party when in opposition defeated by connecting it with the Appropriation clause, and which the Whig party when in power were compelled to carry without that clause. But if the chief credit of the final settlement of this momentous question justly belongs to Peel, it must not be forgotten that in the eleven years during which, as Chief Secretary or as Home Secretary, he was directly responsible for the government of Ireland, he had allowed this monster curse to grow and strengthen without making any serious effort to mitigate it.

Peel was Chief Secretary during the concluding part of the viceroyalty of the Duke of Richmond, during the whole of that of Lord Whitworth, and during part of that of Lord Talbot. He had grown very tired of his position, but agreed to postpone his departure till after a general election, and he at last left Ireland, as he says, with 'undiminished and 'unqualified satisfaction,' in August, 1818. He remained out of office until January, 1822; but the interval was not spent in idleness, and in 1819 he took the leading part in the great Act for resuming cash payments, which, as it has been truly said, attaches to his name 'the same meed of 'praise which he had quoted as inscribed on the tomb of

'Queen Elizabeth: "Moneta in justum valorem redacta."' It is one of his greatest legislative achievements; it is also the first of that series of recantations which forms one of the most distinctive features of his career, for it was based upon the policy which Horner had advocated in 1811, and against which Peel had then voted. He still took, on the Catholic question, the leading part in opposition to Emancipation, declaring his determination to oppose 'a most sincere and 'uncompromising,' though he now feared unavailing, opposition to Catholic concession. The last time the question was brought forward, by Grattan, was in 1819, and he was defeated by a majority of only two. In 1821, after the death of Grattan and in a new Parliament, Plunket carried a Bill for Catholic Emancipation successfully through all its stages in the House of Commons, though it was afterwards rejected in the Lords. In the ensuing session a similar fate befell a Bill of Canning's to relieve Catholic peers of their disabilities. Some considerable change, however, was introduced into the spirit of the Irish Government by the appointment of Lord Wellesley, who was in favour of the Catholics, to the viceroyalty. One of its most important results was the removal of Saurin from the office of Attorney-General and the appointment of Plunket in his place. Lord Wellesley described this measure to Lady Blessington as the removal of 'an old Orangeman' who, though 'Attorney-General by 'title, had really been Lord-Lieutenant for fifteen years'; but it is evident from the letters of Peel that his warm sympathies, both personal and political, were with Saurin. (Pp. 302, 307, 308, 309.)

The accession of George IV. to the throne in the beginning of 1820 brought to a crisis the quarrel between the new king and his wife, and led to the resignation of Canning in the last days of the year, and Lord Liverpool then tried to induce Peel to enter the cabinet in the vacant post of President of the Board of Control. Peel, however, refused the office, declaring that he differed from some of the proceedings of the ministry about the queen. In the summer of 1821 he again declined a similar offer, chiefly, as it appears, on the ground of uncertain health and of a dislike to official life which his recent marriage had produced. But when Lord Sidmouth resigned the Home Office, Peel proved less inflexible, and on January 17, 1822, he accepted the seals, which he held till 1827. In August Castlereagh, or, as he now was, Lord Londonderry, committed suicide. Lord Liverpool saw the necessity of recalling Canning to

the cabinet as Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Canning would accept the post only as leader of the House of Commons. The king hated Canning, and would gladly have excluded him altogether from the ministry, and Eldon and the Duke of Newcastle greatly desired that the leadership of the House of Commons should be given to Peel. Canning, however, who had been sixteen years longer in Parliament than Peel, had both the right and the power to insist upon the leadership, and Peel acquiesced in his claim with honourable frankness. Except on the Catholic question they appear to have cordially agreed, and something of the success of Canning's brilliant foreign policy is due to the loyalty with which he was supported by Peel in the cabinet and at court.

Our space will not permit us to relate at length the history of Peel's conduct as home minister. The Catholic question was rapidly advancing to a crisis, and the system of a divided ministry in which it was an open question, and in which the leading ministers took opposite sides, was becoming plainly impossible. Ireland was again in a state of anarchy bordering on civil war, and the foundation, in 1823, of the Catholic Association by O'Connell and Sheil gave a new impulse to the agitation. The Duke of Wellington, who knew the country well and was not liable to panic, predicted that the new association if it continued would lead to civil war, and declared that the organisation of the disaffected in Ireland was much more perfect than in 1798. (P. 348.) At the same time the long-protracted and increasing violence of the conflict had aroused fierce Orange passions both in the North and in Dublin, while in England the king was embarrassing even his 'anti-Catholic' ministers by the vehemence of his hostility to concession. He described Peel as 'the 'king's Protestant Minister' and Lord Wellesley as an 'enemy in the camp.' He assured Peel that, whether the Cabinet wished it or not, he would never consent to give letters of precedence to a Roman Catholic barrister, and he wrote Peel a formal letter in which he said, 'the sentiments 'of the king upon Catholic emancipation are those of his 'revered and excellent father; from those sentiments the 'king never can and never will deviate.' (Pp. 349, 358, 359, 370–371.)

Peel, while maintaining his unflinching hostility to important concessions, tried to moderate all parties. He implored the king to make no public declaration. (P. 351.) He wrote to Ireland strongly discouraging the violence of the Orangemen and urging that

'in this age of liberal doctrine, when prescription is no longer even a presumption in favour of what is established, it will be a work of desperate difficulty to contend against "Emancipation," as they call it, unless we can fight with the advantage on our side of great discretion, forbearance, and moderation on the part of the Irish Protestants.' (P. 341.)

He recurred to his old idea of establishing a system of unsectarian national education (p. 344), and he readily abandoned the corrupt and proselytising charter schools. He supported a measure of Lord Nugent, which Lord Eldon succeeded in defeating in the Lords, for extending to the English Catholics such privileges as were already possessed by Catholics in Ireland, and he fully approved of a letter written on behalf of the cabinet to the Lord-Lieutenant urging 'that a disposition should be manifested to admit 'the Roman Catholics of Ireland to a fair proportion of the 'emoluments and honours to which they are eligible by law,' but without issuing patents of precedence. (P. 358.)

On matters unconnected with the Catholic question his administration was skilful and, on the whole, enlightened; and in 1823 he introduced the first of a series of important measures diminishing the enormous number of capital offences that disgraced the English criminal code, and, at the same time, doing much to simplify and consolidate that code. In this, as in most respects, there was little original in his legislation. He followed, at some distance, in the steps of Romilly and Mackintosh, and he left very much to be done, which was chiefly accomplished during the Whig ascendency that followed the Reform Bill of 1832. It appears, from some remarkable letters in this volume, that, before Peel took up the question of criminal reform, George IV. was exceedingly sensible of the enormity of executing very young men for secondary offences, and that he was continually pressing on his ministers a more merciful administration of the law. He sometimes found Peel by no means ready to yield. In one case Peel invoked the aid of the Cabinet to overrule the wish of the king, who desired to save two culprits from the gallows; and, in another case, he threatened to resign his office if the king persisted in commuting the sentence of a youth who had been found guilty of uttering forged notes. (Pp. 315-317.) But Peel had, at least, the merit of recognising an intolerable abuse, and his legislation on the subject was skilfully framed, and still more skilfully introduced and carried. In his patronage in this, as in later periods of his life, he cared much more than most

English ministers for the interests of science, literature, and art. He was by no means indifferent to the opportunities his position gave him of advancing his own family and friends; but he never, in his English patronage, forgot the character of those whom he recommended for promotion, and he brought forward or assisted many men of ability and learning with whom he had no connexion and no political sympathy. The letters in this volume between Peel and his very intimate Oxford friend Dr. Lloyd are especially interesting and characteristic. They are in general very honourable to Peel; but Mr. Parker is much too indulgent when he describes the intensely worldly letters in which Dr. Lloyd urged his own merits and his claims to the bishopric of Oxford as merely 'frank, and free from affectation of the 'traditional *nolo episcopari*.' (P. 438.) Both Peel and Lord Liverpool appear to have had a much stronger sense than most of their predecessors of the responsibilities attaching to Church patronage and of the duty of administering it in the public interest, and in this respect they were broadly distinguished from Lord Eldon.

'It is really a cruel thing,' Lord Liverpool wrote to Peel, 'that the patronage of the Crown as to Church matters should be divided between the Minister and the Chancellor, and that all the public claims should fall upon the former. The Chancellor has nine livings to the Minister's one. With respect to these he does occasionally attend to local claims, but he has besides four cathedrals, and to no one of these Cathedrals has any man of distinguished learning or merit been promoted.' (Pp. 362–363).

In the beginning of 1825 the Irish Government, having without consulting Peel undertaken a foolish prosecution of O'Connell for a not very dangerous speech, received a heavy rebuff, for the Grand Jury threw out the Bill, and the prosecution of an Orange leader was equally unsuccessful. A Bill was about the same time brought in and carried, suppressing the new association; but it could not suppress the spirit which it had aroused. O'Connell, however, was thoroughly alarmed at the state of the country, and as far as possible from desiring a rebellion, and he was at this time in a very conciliatory mood. He was perfectly ready to accept an endowment for the priesthood, which would attach them to the Government, and also a considerable raising of the Irish franchise. This was the last occasion on which his party and the Catholic gentry very cordially concurred, and it was the last occasion on which the Catholic question could have been settled on a basis that would have given real strength to the empire. A

relief bill passed through all its stages in the Commons by considerable majorities, and it was followed by a bill for raising the qualifications of Irish electors, and by a resolution for endowing the priesthood. O'Connell fully believed that Catholic Emancipation would definitely pass in this session,* and he appeared to have excellent reasons for his belief. In Ireland it generally prevailed, and it exercised an immediate pacifying influence. Lord Fingal and other Catholic noblemen, in presenting an address at this time to the king, were able to say 'the whole of Ireland reposes in 'profound tranquillity, and the law, without the aid of any 'extraordinary power, everywhere receives voluntary obedi-'ence.' (P. 373.) It was afterwards stated by Lord George Bentinck that Peel had changed his opinions about Catholic Emancipation in 1825, and had communicated this change to Lord Liverpool. The letters before us, however, conclusively prove that if Peel was shaken, it was not about the merits of Emancipation, but about the practicability of resisting it. Having been four times defeated in the Commons on the Catholic question, he tendered his resignation, and Lord Liverpool at once declared that without his assistance he could not continue the struggle. Peel was the only minister in the House of Commons opposed to the Catholic cause, differing on the question from all his colleagues in the House. If he had resigned, and if Lord Liverpool had followed his example, there is good reason to believe that a government might have been formed which would have carried the measure safely and speedily with the securities that had been accepted. Most unfortunately for the empire, the 'Protestant' party persuaded Peel to withdraw his resignation in order to avert this surrender. In the House of Lords the Duke of York, who was the heir presumptive to the throne, stood up and declared his unalterable opposition to the Catholic claims, 'whatever might 'be his situation in life, so help him God,' and the Lords rejected the Bill by a majority of 48.

The conscientious views of George III. obtained some measure of respect even from those who believed them to be most unfounded; but no halo of sanctity dignified the scruples of George IV. or of the Duke of York. The Irish Catholics, exasperated at the present disappointment of their hopes, and at the prospect of another hostile king, flung themselves into a furious agitation, and in a few

* Fitzpatrick's 'Correspondence of O'Connell,' i. p. 108.

months all the progress which had been made towards pacifying the country was undone, while in England Peel had to meet a terrible commercial crisis. Seventy county banks stopped in less than a week. In dealing with questions of commerce and currency Peel was always in his element, and his measures appear to have been wise and skilful. A general election took place, and he was again returned by the University of Oxford as the uncompromising opponent of Catholic Emancipation. In England the anti-Catholic party gained some seats, and the increasing violence in Ireland had produced some reaction. In Ireland it was soon apparent that what Grattan had feared had come to pass, and that the tie which had hitherto attached the people to their landlords was completely broken. The priests everywhere appeared at the head of their people, and it was at once seen that a new and terrible power was dominating Irish politics. In Waterford, where the Beresfords had long been omnipotent, they were totally defeated, and Leslie Foster sent Peel a vivid description of his own defeat in the Louth election. At the outset of the contest, upwards of five-sixths of the votes were promised to him; but the whole priesthood turned themselves into electioneering agents against him. In every chapel there were political sermons; the priests menaced all who voted for him with eternal damnation; they were present at every polling booth to overawe their parishioners; and their efforts were seconded by savage mobs who waylaid and beat all opponents, and forced multitudes of Protestants, by threats of assassination or of the burning of their houses, to vote against their promises and their convictions. 'In the county town 'the studied violence and intimidation were such that it was 'only by locking up my voters in enclosed yards that their 'lives were preserved.' By these means the election was won. What, asked Foster, will be the end of this? 'The 'landlords are exasperated to the utmost, the priests swagger-'ing in their triumph, the tenantry sullen and insolent. Men 'who, a month ago, were all civility and submission now 'hardly suppress their curses when a gentleman passes by. 'The text of every village orator is, "Boys, you have put "down three lords; stick to your priests, and you will carry "all before you."' (Pp. 409–411.)

The letters of Goulburn, the Chief Secretary, show that the picture was not overcharged.

'Never,' he wrote, 'were Roman Catholic and Protestant so decidedly opposed. Never did the former act with so general a concert, or place

themselves so completely under the command of the priesthood.' 'The priests exercise on all matters a dominion perfectly uncontrolled and uncontrollable. In many parts of the country their sermons are purely political, and the altars in the several chapels are the rostra from which they declaim on the subject of Roman Catholic grievances, exhort to the collection of rent, or denounce their Protestant neighbours in a mode perfectly intelligible and effective, but not within the grasp of the law. In several towns no Roman Catholic will now deal with a Protestant shopkeeper, in consequence of the priests' interdiction, and this species of interference, stirring up enmity on one hand and feelings of resentment on the other, is mainly conducive to outrage and disorder. . . . The first vacancy on the Roman Catholic bench is to be supplied by Dr. England from America, a man of all others most decidedly hostile to British interests and the most active in fomenting the discord of this country. . . . With such leaders it is reasonable to anticipate the worst. It is impossible to detail in a letter the various modes in which the Roman Catholic priesthood now interfere in every transaction of every description, how they rule the mob, the gentry, and the magistracy, and how they impede the administration of justice.' Their power is greater than any other in the state, 'and they love to display it, and omit no opportunity of taunting their adversaries.' 'The state of society here is so disorganised, and the government has so inferior an authority to other powers acting on the people, that the opinion formed to-day may be quite changed to-morrow.' (Pp. 416, 418, 419, 422.)

The election of 1826 virtually carried Catholic Emancipation, for it reduced Ireland to a state in which it was impossible long to resist it. Clear-sighted men had no difficulty in perceiving that the policy of Peel had failed to avert it, though it had succeeded in making impossible the securities which Grattan and the wisest men of his generation had pronounced indispensable for its safe working, in kindling religious hatreds as intense as in the darkest period of the eighteenth century, in breaking down that healthy relation and subordination of classes on which beyond all other things the future well-being of Ireland depended. Peel was not wholly blind to what was happening. 'A darker cloud than ever,' he wrote, 'seems to me 'to impend over Ireland, that is if one of the remaining 'bonds of society, the friendly connexion between landlord 'and tenant, is dissolved.' (Pp. 413, 420.) He still persuaded himself, however, that the political power of the priests was transient, and that a reaction would set in that might destroy it. (P. 413.) The defeat of the Catholic question in the new Parliament by a majority of four encouraged him in his resistance. In January, 1827, the death of the Duke of York removed one serious obstacle to the Catholic cause, and

six weeks later Lord Liverpool, who had so long held together the divided ministry, was struck down by apoplexy. Peel would gladly have continued in his present position if a peer of real weight who held his opinions on the Catholic question was appointed to the vacant place. But there was no such peer, except Wellington, to be found, and under Wellington Canning refused to serve. Canning had, indeed, now fully resolved to be at the head of the administration, and Peel refused to serve under him.

With his opinions on the Catholic question it is impossible to blame him, and the letters which passed between the two statesmen are very honourable to both, and show clearly that in spite of great divergence of opinion, character, and interests, each could recognise the good faith of the other. In a letter written to one of his brothers Peel describes his position with complete frankness.

'I am content with my position in the Government, and willing to retain it—willing to see Mr. Canning leader of the House of Commons, as he has been. But giving him credit for honesty and sincerity, if he is at the head of the Government, and has all the patronage of the Government, he must exert himself as an honest man to carry the Catholic question; and to the carrying of that question, to the preparation for its being carried, I never can be a party. Still less can I be a party to it for the sake of office.'

These words were written little more than a year before Peel undertook, as minister of the Crown, to introduce a measure of Catholic emancipation. But if they do little credit to his prescience, no one can mistake the accent of sincerity in what follows.

'I do not choose to see new lights on the Catholic question precisely at that conjuncture when the Duke of York has been laid in his grave and Lord Liverpool struck dumb by the palsy. Would any man, woman, or child believe that after nineteen years' stubborn unbelief I was converted, at the very moment Mr. Canning was Prime Minister, out of pure conscience and the force of truth?' (P. 185.)

With the resignation of Peel and the other anti-Catholic members of Lord Liverpool's government, and the formation of the short Canning ministry, this instalment of Peel's letters comes to an end. We trust that no very long period may elapse before the remainder of this very interesting correspondence is placed before the public, and we rejoice that it is in the hands of an editor who is at once so competent and so judicious.

ART. II.—1. *Forty Years in a Moorland Parish: Reminiscences and Researches in Danby-in-Cleveland.* By the Rev. J. C. ATKINSON, D.C.L. London: 1891.

2. *History of Cleveland, Ancient and Modern.* By the Rev. J. C. ATKINSON. Barrow-in-Furness: 1874.

3. *A Glossary of the Cleveland Dialect: Explanatory, Derivative, and Critical.* By the Rev. J. C. ATKINSON. London: 1868.

'GOING to see you place!' exclaimed a friendly shipowner to the author of the above-named works, on hearing, six-and-forty years ago, that he had 'thoughts of 'going a-prospecting' in connexion with an offer of a living in Yorkshire. 'Why, Danby was not found out when 'they sent Bonaparte to St. Helena, or else they never 'would have taken the trouble to send him all the way 'there!' None the less, Dr. Atkinson found himself, one fine afternoon not many days later, riding towards Whitby from Scarborough, while unaccustomed sights and sounds—for he was born and reared a south-countryman—claimed at every instant his alert but divided attention. In those days the flight of an eagle above 'the wild solitary tracks and 'the deep pitches and steep ravine-banks of the North 'Yorkshire moors' could still occasionally be watched; 'two or three large hawks might well be seen on the wing 'at once; and the curlew skirled as he crossed, far above 'your head, from the wild moors of Goathland or Glaisdale, 'where he bred then and breeds still, to the sea-coast on 'the east.' Grouse and golden plover, too, were visible in plenty; and mysterious symmetrical hillocks—the 'howes' of native speech—dotted the heathy waste on either side. The voyage of discovery, inland and upland from Whitby, was prosecuted next day. Along a rugged and unfrequented road the solitary horseman pursued his way to

'the Beacon, the highest point, howe-crowned, of all that part of the North Yorkshire moors, and the site of a beacon in Armada times, and on many subsequent occasions, when it was thought or feared that invasion might ensue. Before me, looking westward, was moor, so that I could see nothing else. On either side was moor, with a valley on the left; and on the right, to the north, an expanse of cultivated land beyond. Across the valley just named there was moor again, and the valley was, it was clear, but a narrow one; while behind me, as I knew, lay three good miles of moor, and nothing but moor. It was a solitude, and a singularly lonely solitude. The only

signs of life were given by the grouse, or the half-wild moor-sheep, whose fleeces here and there flecked the brown moor with white spots. It was a wild as well as a lonely solitude, and yet not dreary, nor could one well feel altogether alone. For there, from the south-east, round by the north to Tees-mouth on the north-east, and thence on again, straight out to the north, along the coast of Durham and Northumberland, was the great wide open sea; and no one feels alone in sight of the sea, any more than under the clear canopy of a starry heaven in a bright cloudless winter's night. Nay, the stillness of such a night, far more than the wild wailings of the rushing blast, is instinct with the wisht, weird creatures of the imagination—far too much so for the superstitious or fancy-led to be able to feel themselves alone, and more so yet to one fairly cognisant of his inner life and its connexions. And the sea, even at a distance, is a creature a being—full of a great vitality, and with many voices; and by aid of one of them, at least, whatever the mood of the listener, there is an inner and most real communion with the Unseen.' (P. 40.)

But his destination was still neither at hand nor quite obviously accessible; and wide tracts of 'ling' had to be traversed more or less at a venture before a valley, lovely with tree-fringed streams, and verdant with waving corn, opened up a cheering prospect. Here, in fact, lay ensconced the hamlet of Danby, with its parsonage-house, the goal of the adventurous excursion.

'It was a long, low, grey building, on a sort of grassy terrace by the roadside, and with nothing between it and the roadway. At one end were a cowhouse and other like premises, and at the other a low lean-to shed, appearing to give access to some sort of a back kitchen or scullery. Beyond the one window which looked out upon the highway was a door, twin to the one opening into the cowhouse, and quite innocent of any such appendage as a knocker or a bell—innocent even, one would have said, of any suspicion that such things existed. But seeing no other door, and no way that seemed to lead to any other, I made up my mind to knock at this one. I knocked once, twice, and again, with no response. I learned in after-days that I ought to have gone to the door in the lean-to, the only one in use by all the members of the family. . . . Not suspecting this, I went on knocking, and at last I heard a slow step, evidently sounding from an uncarpeted floor of stone, approaching the door. Slowly the door was unlocked and the bolts drawn, and as slowly was it opened, but not for more than a few inches. As well as I could see, the person who opened it was an old man, clad in a rusty black coat, with drab breeches and continuations, and with a volume of what was supposed to be white neckcloth about his throat.'

A dialogue ensued, terminated by the visitor being 'requested to walk in and partake of what he afterwards 'found was the dinner prepared for the family at large, who

'were, meanwhile, left hungry and expectant in the kitchen.' For the patriarchal custom then still prevailed, and is not yet wholly extinct in Danby, by which masters and servants ate in common, without so much as the distinction of above or below the salt. The poor old clergyman, to whose simple establishment his successor was thus unconventionally introduced, appears to have been well-meaning and without guile, and his appeal to him to 'be kind to his people' had, in spite of his odd gloss upon it, a quaint pathos of its own. But he was incapacitated, both by age and ill-health, from serious exertion; and his care could, hence, not possibly be more than nominal of two parishes covering in all 22,600 acres of broken and often storm-swept country. The ecclesiastical machine had, accordingly, almost ceased to move; and Dr. Atkinson's fresh energies must have had enough to do to mend its broken springs and pull it out of the rut of dilapidation. His preliminary survey of the parish-church disclosed a scarcely credible state of neglect.

'The altar-table,' he tells us, 'was not only rickety, and with one leg shorter than the others, and, besides that, mean and worm-eaten, but it was covered with what it would have been a severe and sarcastic libel to call a piece of green baize, for it was in rags, and of any, or almost every, colour save the original green! And even that was not all: it was covered thickly over with stale crumbs.' (P. 44.)

Enquiry elicited the fact that there, of all places, the Sunday-school teachers made a weekly picnic. 'They must get their 'meat (*i.e.* food) somewhere, and they gets it here,' he was told.

'Everything,' he continues, 'was in hateful harmony with what I have thus described. There lay the dirty, shabby surplice, flung negligently over the altar-railing, itself paintless and broken, and the vestment with half its length trailing on the dirty, unswept floor. The pulpit inside was reeking with accumulated dust and scraps of torn paper. The font was an elongated, attenuated reproduction of a double eggcup, or hour-glass without the sustaining framework, and in it was a paltry slop-basin, lined with dust, and an end or two of tallow-candle beside it.' *

The picture is completed by a glimpse of the parish-clerk—'a good, harmless man enough'—as he waited for a funeral, 'sitting inside the church in the sunny embrasure of the 'west window, with his hat on, of course, and comfortably 'smoking his pipe.' Since this calm and happy individual was not only clerk but schoolmaster—having been appointed

* Baptisms were rarely solemnised in the church itself,

because 'he could do naught else'—it can readily be imagined that education in Danby fell considerably below the School Board standard. There, we learn with a little shock of surprise, the triad of elementary acquirements, commonly associated together no less closely than the three Graces, was found capable of dissolution. The weekly school-fees were, in fact, regulated on a sliding scale depending upon how many of the 'three Rs' were bargained for by each aspirant to learning.

Many things have changed since that easy time, half a century ago, when pothooks and the multiplication-table still counted as extras in the parish curriculum; when the passmen of the village might scrape through with the bare alphabet, and the rule-of-three marked the highest achievement of local scholarship. Many things have changed, and, in our author's opinion, essentially for the better. But even levelling-up processes are attended by drawbacks. They inevitably leave a great deal to be desired, and usually involve something to be regretted. With the advance of civilisation—and, on the whole, civilisation *is* advancing—much that is characteristic cannot fail to drop out of use and wont for ever. The abolition of the abuses of ignorance is at the cost of the spread of a leaden uniformity. Local diversities become effaced; local customs perish; local amusements lose their zest; and the law of toil, pressing with dull monotony, grows intolerable, and provokes revolt.

The district of North-eastern Yorkshire called by the Danish invaders of the ninth century, on account of its rugged appearance, 'Cliff-land,' or Cleveland, extends along the sea-coast from the Tees to the Esk, and inland, over some twenty-four miles, to the crests of the Cleveland hills. So much of it—and the proportion is considerable—as is tilted up on the stalwart shoulders of these robust caryatides is varied and picturesque; and in this more romantic region the parish of Danby is included. But moorland scenery fully exerts its indefinable charm only upon patient and appreciative spectators. Not every holiday-maker can hope to gather, in a day's outing, treasures of beauty which eye and mind alike must be trained to perceive, and claiming, moreover, time and opportunity for their leisurely developement. To be duly valued they need, as Dr. Atkinson puts it, 'to be lived among.' He, at least, is in undeniable possession of this qualification. Some years ago his professional perambulations alone summed up, as he roughly calculated, to seventy thousand miles; and much more than

as many more had certainly been traversed by him for purposes other than clerical. Thus he can speak as an expert of landscape, seascape, snowscape, moorscape, and fogscape, to say nothing of other matters investigated during his scanty hours of leisure.

Running water has been the chief agent in producing the distinctive features of Cleveland scenery. Every 'gill' has its 'beck,' every dale its purling brook or (in times of flood) its roaring torrent; and neither beck, brook, nor torrent has been idle these few tens of thousands of years back. Each in its degree has been incessantly at work carving, excavating, abrading, first detaching, and then removing superfluous material, and so, little by little, creating the complex entanglement of scarped ravines, cut deep into the massive bulk of the uplifted shales and sandstones, now so inexhaustibly delightful to lovers and students of Nature.

It is 'a district of surprises.' Now and then, in some rare winter's night, 'unimaginable glories' of colour momentarily reveal themselves through the unequal fading on the retina of the various chromatic impressions combined to produce the dazzling whiteness of lightning-illuminated tracts of snow; and the 'frost artist' is nowhere more lavish or more ingenious in his devices of transient embellishment. Ravishing autumnal effects may be caught when sheets of bracken are burnished into 'old gold,' the lush summer-greens of the valleys have become sere and ethereal, and the vast expanses of the boundless prospect fade from gorgeous purple into the faint, aërial bloom of remote distance. Then come days of magic clearness, surprising the pedestrian as he toils up 'from the depths and gullies of Danby Head,' with a view of York Minster, twenty-three miles off, 'like a huge 'ship at anchor on the surface, but not the extreme limit of 'the surface, of a great, smooth, still ocean.'* Nor should the panorama from Beacon Hill be forgotten, any more than the endless and ever-new combinations of rock, wood, and water discoverable among the romantic fastnesses of the Dales Heads, the far-off charm of the coast-views, or the intimate delights to be derived from daily explorations of braes, gullies, and nooks, by rivulets 'wanton and wild,' now dimpling in sunshine, now slipping silently along mossy dells, now brawling and foaming into rapids and cataracts.

Such delights belong in fullest measure to the naturalist;

* 'Moorland Parish,' p. 374.

and not even Gilbert White was more profoundly versed in the manners and customs of the flying and crawling denizens of Selborne, than Dr. Atkinson in the ways and haunts of his irresponsible parishioners at Danby. Like Gilbert White, too, he is, above all, a bird-lover. Not so much an ornithologist in the formal sense—although amply provided with ornithological knowledge—as a confidential acquaintance of those 'fowls of the air' with which opportunities of intercourse have come in his way. Better company need not be desired. But admittance to the society of feathered tribes is not to be had for the asking. Natural aptitude is required, and a process of initiation, which must be begun early and continued long, to be shortened, perhaps, in future by the phonographic acquisition of bird-language, after the fashion of a recent investigator of monkey-talk. In the provisional absence, however, of the modern Melampus, the empirical reproduction of bird-calls is often successful, and was particularly useful in the practice of a lucrative and not unlearned profession formerly much in vogue. A reclaimed poacher, once in the service of Dr. Atkinson, told him that he had often shot up to seven grouse, one after the other, by summoning them to the spot with a masterly imitation of their peculiar note. And the same John and his master—himself no less accomplished in vocal stratagems—took each other in on one occasion with ludicrous completeness. They were scouting for game on opposite sides of a low eminence; each feigned himself a golden plover—both were deceived. They approached, stealthily crouching, emitting the cries and answers of the birds they personated; then rushed up the final ridge with guns 'at the ready,' to meet each his match in a fraudulent wearer of a hat and leggings! 'Sic notus Ulysses?' each crestfallen dupe and impostor might have demanded of his fellow-victim and fellow-cheat.

Bird-life no longer presents the variety of forty years ago. An ornithologist, whether *difficilis* and *querulus* or not, can hardly fail to be a *laudator temporis acti*. One species after another has become locally extinct; winged colonisers or inmates of the district have either disappeared, or linger on the verge of total and final disappearance. In every part of England similar changes might doubtless be recorded. They have certainly been very striking in Norfolk. Dr. Jessopp tells us, in his 'Arcady,' that in the beginning of this century the great bustard was not uncommon in the flats about Sandringham; and bittern, storks, and horned

owls have equally vanished with the clearing away of the scrub and heather attendant upon recent agricultural improvements. Within Dr. Atkinson's memory, the raven has been extirpated from Cleveland; the barn-owl predeceased the raven; the screech-owl is doomed, if not actually gone; merlins, buzzards, and harriers are scarcely any longer to be seen; kestrels have been 'ridded out of the country.' The persecution of these last, moreover, was for crimes in which they were merely accomplices after the fact. For, if our author be right, they do no more than pick up the leavings of hawks in the way of grouse and partridges. 'And what,' he asks, 'is the consequence, or one of the 'consequences,' of the wholesale destruction of birds of prey, no less than of weasels, their four-footed coadjutors? 'An inordinate increase of field mice, long tails, and short 'tails, and all sorts of tails together.' Thus, in the parsonage garden alone, during eighteen days of last winter, thirty-five mice were trapped with the aid of 'mouse-catching 'enginery' of sundry and the most approved kinds; and the farmers complain that in the fields these 'tim'rous beasties' are 'getting to be over bad for owght with the holes they 'mak's in the fields, and the heaps of earth they brings 'out.' 'And this was *à propos* to my complaint that they 'had got into the church, and had injured our valuable 'American organ to such an extent that it would cost 'several pounds to make the damage good. They have 'actually eaten some of the wooden stop-couplers quite 'through.'

Starlings are, in the pages before us, vindicated from the charge of devastating strawberry-beds. Dr. Atkinson has reared colonies of them, with detriment, indeed, to his flowers, but with none to his fruit. In this department blackbirds, missel-thrushes, and ring-ousels are the chief miscreants. Nor have they escaped scot-free. Of missel-thrushes he professes to have 'shot scores on scores, year 'after year,' in defence of his strawberries.

'But,' he continues, 'the moor blackbird or ring-ousel is the bird of all birds to "walk into" your fruit of the berry sort. I do not know for certain that birds do blush, or else I should say that he is the most unblushing, the most unabashed of all possible delinquents in the fruit-stealing and wasting line. His effrontery exceeds that of the Irish member of fiction, of caricature even. The blackbird flies away when caught in the act with a startled cackle; the thrush retires with an apologetic cheep. But the moor blackbird—always a past master in birds' Billingsgate—swears at you, calls you all the choicest names in his repertory, blackguards you for interfering with his meal,

and, if forced to make himself scarce, does so with the assurance, emphatically delivered and repeated, that "you are no gentleman." (P. 320.)

Our author deals in a proper spirit of scientific scepticism with the famous toad-in-a-hole question, of old a standing zoological puzzle. No doubt these and other reptiles tolerate highly incommodious lodgings, ill-ventilated, and all but inaccessible by so much as a floating bacillus germ, yet not absolutely sealed against communication with the outer world. Toads 'live, and move, and have their being'—arguments of whatever seeming cogency notwithstanding—within the range of the ordinary laws of organic nature. Were it otherwise, the problem of the habitability of the moon, and of several uninviting planets, would at once be solved.

Of antique human colonisation Cleveland offers abundant traces, and Dr. Atkinson has much that is interesting to tell about ramparts and barrows—the works of the living and the abodes of the dead in pre-historic times. He is a practised and a wary digger, 'knows his way about' in grave-mounds as few do, and can grope along the approaches to a funereal deposit with unerring instinct. His success as a finder has, accordingly, not been small. No less than forty-three cinerary vases disinterred by his personal exertions, besides sundry flint arrow-heads, axe-hammers, bone-pins, and jet-beads, are now stored in the British Museum. And we join with him in regretting that 'they are not all grouped together as a collection belonging 'to one definite and strictly limited Yorkshire district.' Still, that is a secondary matter. The main point is, that they have been landed high and dry on the shelves of a safe repository, beyond the reach of the rising waters of destruction. The preservation of ancient monuments in Cleveland owes much to the unproductiveness of the land they occupy. Moor and morass have hitherto escaped the incursions of the plough. But it is an encroaching instrument, and only a rabid archæologist could deplore the extension of arable territory. The ploughing of 'Thornaby Holms' may compete in importance with the collection of many potsherds.

The reputation of containing treasure has been a motive rather for the violation of grave-mounds than for their actual demolition. In the Middle Ages, formal search-warrants were issued to applicants, whose quest, although it must have been fruitless, was persevering. And they most likely had had predecessors in the same pursuit, for every

howe in Cleveland is marked by a central depression, where a shaft was, at some remote epoch, sunk downward towards the expected nuclear hoard. To this very day the notion of its presence vaguely subsists. The appropriation of materials, however, from these tumuli furnishes profit of a more substantial kind. They are sometimes turned to account as quarries, without overmuch regard to learned solicitude for their contents. Dr. Atkinson's anxious interrogatories of agents in the removal of stones from barrows evoked replies capable of adding to the torments of Tantalus, had that ancient worthy been an antiquarian. One Philistine yeoman, to the query whether he had met with urns (locally, 'pannikins'), answered, with supreme indifference, 'Aye, a vast o' times! Done wiv 'em? Whah, brussen 'em up wi' my feet!' Another declared laconically that he had 'bunched 'em a-bits!'*

The protective influence of superstition is scarcely operative in Yorkshire. Here, as in other regions virtually Scandinavian, grave-mounds are often assigned as their residences to certain dwarfish folk, originally, perhaps, representing the spirits of those interred in them. So that the notion of their being the hiding-places of precious metals is really of the legendary kind exemplified in the story of the Nibelungen treasure, and is quite disconnected from any reasonable anticipation of enrichment with the relics of prehistoric splendour. The underground personages in charge of these mysterious accumulations are usually regarded as of a somewhat captious and irascible disposition—as, on the whole, 'ill to anger'—and in the Isle of Man, no longer ago than in 1859, a heifer was actually sacrificed and burnt by way of atonement to the unseen inmates for the desecration of one of their sepulchral abodes.† The Cleveland mannikins are, however, comparatively tolerant, since they have hitherto refrained from exacting penalties of any description for archæological digging and burrowing.

In fundamental character the tumuli of the district present little diversity. All are technically 'round barrows'; all contain cremated remains deposited in earthenware vessels. A few bronze implements are found near the coast—none on the moors. Traces of many successive interments in the same barrow are frequently met with, and

* 'History of Cleveland,' p. 85.

† Boyd Dawkins, 'Early Man in Britain,' p. 338.

our author counted in one no less than sixteen distinct deposits, extending most probably over a long series of years. One case was noted by him of obviously deliberate, seemingly contemptuous, scattering and wasting of the antecedent remains to make room for those of a new comer, belonging possibly to a race of victorious invaders. But the neolithic chronicle merges very quickly into reverie.

'In truth,' we read in the work before us (p. 147), 'there were many things in the interior of these old-world burying places to set the thoughtful man thinking and the speculative man imagining, gue sing, reconstructing. No two of those of the larger size were built of the same material or planned on precisely the same principle. In one I found a circular platform of symmetrically piled stone. It was twenty feet in diameter, nearly six feet in vertical depth, with a cist neatly constructed in the centre, and the entire level surface of it covered six inches deep with the whitest, snowiest sand. It was years upon years, twenty-four or twenty-five, I should say, before I ascertained where that sand could have been procured from. I knew of its existence, but not in anything like sufficient purity to supply a tithe of what I saw bestrewing that platform. And the place at which, as I at last ascertained, it could have been obtained in the requisite whiteness and quantity, was at least seven miles distant in a linear direction.'

They were not economists of trouble, those shadowy, laborious builders. At the heart of one large grave hill Dr. Atkinson found a cairn made up of basaltic masses, heaped together into a conical pile—sixteen feet in diameter, six in vertical height. There could be no uncertainty about their place of origin.

'Everybody,' he says, 'has heard of the "Whinstone dike" that runs transversely across Cleveland, entering the district no great way from Yarm, and running a south-easterly course of nearly thirty-five miles, only slightly deflected from a perfectly direct line. It was this whinstone or basaltic dike which had furnished every individual block in the whole of that very considerable cairn, and the nearest point at which it could have been obtained in the quantities employed was at least three miles and a half away, and across the untracked moor, with swamp and morass to cross and recross on the route. . . .

'As a rule, I should say that the constituent materials of all the largest howes—and some of them are very large, one being ninety feet in diameter at the base, and even still thirteen feet in height—were brought from a distance. There are no signs of excavation, or even of removal of the former surface, anywhere in their vicinity; I have ascertained that by direct personal examination. I am inclined to think, too, that the work was done not only very carefully, but very systematically, whether merely for the due preservation of symmetry, or, it might be, under the direction of some chief, or the personal over-

sight and engineering of some skin-clad "clerk of the works," with curiously tattooed body and limbs.' (P. 148.)

All that can be said as to the date of these enigmatical monuments is that it was later than that of the 'long 'barrows' constructed to receive inhumed remains. These are generally attributed to the Iberian or Silurian race, exhibited in sample to modern ethnologists by the Basques of the Pyrenees, but submerged in England by a Celtic invasion. The howe-builders of Cleveland were, then, in their day, victors and heroes. They moved in the van of civilisation; their advent implied progress and, after a fashion, culture. For they were acquainted with the use of bronze, and the use of bronze imported an incalculable gain of power. Not until Cæsar landed on the coast of Kent did they meet their superiors. But that was after many centuries.

Dr. Atkinson shows, with great probability, that the supposed 'British villages' of Cleveland mark, not the sites of dwellings of any kind, but the scenes of antique mining operations. These extensive groups of circular depressions are situated, very remarkably, just where the ironstone of that region crops out; and this significant indication is confirmed by the presence (not always, however, in close proximity to the pits) of numerous cinder-hills or slag-heaps, attesting the reduction, in considerable quantities, of iron ore. 'Jet-'holes,' too, are extant, reminding our attentive observer of the 'flint pits' of Norfolk; and the fidelity with which the course of mineral-bearing strata in general is followed by collections of disused shafts affords convincing evidence that their arrangement had designed reference to subterranean wealth. Careful exploration might finally disprove the 'British village' theory, by disclosing horizontal in connexion with the vertical workings; and the trial would, at any rate, be well worth making. Some light might, by the same means, be thrown upon the identity of the miners—at present a matter of conjecture, although the Romans are traditionally credited with the discovery of the iron treasures of Cleveland.

It was certainly, however, not the Romans who constructed the singular defensive works known as the 'Danes' 'Dyke,' the 'Argam Lines,' and the 'Scamridge Trenches.' Their strategic value has been recognised by high military authorities, but can be fully appreciated only through the realisation of the ancient state of the country. They strike across the echeloned moorland ridges, so as to block 'certain 'lines of communication between the Cleveland seaboard

'and the interior.' But in the earliest historic times, 'all 'that was not moorland in the entire Dales district was a 'series of swampy marshes, intergrown rather than over-'grown with wood and forest,' and still more was this the case in prehistoric times; hence the blocking of the lines in question was tantamount to the total inhibition of the march of any force from the interior against the invaders from the sea.

'Moreover,' we are told, 'all these dikes seem to have one general feature in common, and to indicate one special intention. As defensive works at all, they are defensive against attacks delivered from the south, and in no other direction whatever. Wherever the works are left sufficiently undamaged by time or depredation to admit of adequate examination, that is the direct testimony of them. There is one, for instance, of which a small section is yet so far intact as to permit it to be definitely asserted that the front of it, facing south, has been faced with stone, and had a deep ditch before it. Besides, as it would appear from what is left still standing, stone posts have been set thickly along the crest of it, of nearly four feet in height above the surface, and yet almost flush with the aforesaid stone-faced front.' (P. 154.)

The successive lines of fortification commemorate, in General Pitt Rivers's opinion, successive stages of occupation, one base being at Flamborough Head, while another (Dr. Atkinson thinks) may be identified in the remarkable fortification at Eston Nab. Nor are we left wholly in the dark as to the kinship of the constructors. A cutting through the Danes' Dyke revealed the fact that the labourers employed on it 'not only used flint implements, but made 'them, and, moreover, made them on the spot.' Chippings, spiculæ, remnants of flint, lay as thickly spread within the piled earth

'as the shavings and scraps and odds and ends of wood below the joiner's bench. The inference was obvious. While the works, misnamed the Danes' Dyke, were yet in progress, while they lacked still some feet of the intended or ultimate height and massiveness, some among the host of the builders were plying their vocation as makers and fashioners of those indispensable flint weapons and implements. There lay the little piles and accumulations of the chips and refuse material, ready to be covered up and preserved by the next course in the building of the bulwark, and for discovery and cross-questioning and interpretation by the modern military engineer.'

These prehistoric sappers, however, like the mound builders in their vicinity, may have been in possession of such latest improvements as bronze implements, while still predominantly employing stone tools. There, as elsewhere, the ages considerably overlapped. The transition was

gradual, seeming at first of little moment, yet fraught, in point of fact, with the future destinies of rival peoples.

'What, then,' our author asks, 'is to hinder the inference that the Danes' Dyke invaders, wielders of bronze weapons as well as users of flint-headed arrows and javelins, prevailed over the simply stone-weaponed denizens of the land of which they had arrived as the invaders; that, as prevailing, they became occupiers; and that, as occupiers, they left those intelligible, if not communicative, memorials of themselves which have been so abundantly met with in the grave mounds and earthworks of the district?' (P. 158.)

The deduction is plausible, and enables us, if its validity be admitted, to realise with some distinctness the method by which the first Aryan invasion of Britain was accomplished. The builders of the Danes' Dyke and the Argam Lines (ancestors, probably, of the woad-stained Ancient Britons) set cautiously and resolutely about the business of securing their position in the country. And, their position once secured, they were equally determined in exterminating their predecessors. Their hostility was implacable. But the measure that they meted out was filled to the brim later for themselves. In the very same corners of these islands whither, with fire and sword, they drove the Silures, they were afterwards glad to find refuge from the devastating Teutons; and, accordingly, a Silurian element, characterised by the short stature, swarthy complexion, and round skulls of the individuals constituting it, can be discriminated among the Celtic populations of Wales, the Highlands of Scotland, and the province of Munster in Ireland.*

The speech and traditions of modern Cleveland folk are curiously assertive of their Danish descent—or rather were until lately. For local distinctions of all kinds are rapidly growing to be things of the past. Take as an example the good old Yorkshire dialect, which has within living memory lapsed from a thriving actuality into a subject of antiquarian research. To the rising generation it is already in great measure an unknown tongue. The old people, who knew no school-board English, and with whom the pithy phrases of their forefathers were current coin, stamped with many a quaint, half-effaced superscription, have carried the implicit lore of their familiar talk with them to the grave; except in so far as it has been rescued, of set purpose, by such philological inquirers as our present author, who, during the long

* Boyd Dawkins, op. cit., p. 330.

period of his incumbency at Danby, has been indefatigable in collecting and recording the perishing relics of Anglo-Danish speech. Stored in the museum of his admirable Glossary, a large stock of these are now at least safe from the impending doom of oblivion, if no longer privileged, in their dried and dissected state, to breathe the breath of common life. Their salvage is all the more important that the Yorkshire idiom has given rise to no popular literature, and can scarcely be said to survive in the inept imitations met with in 'Nicholas Nickleby' and other *foreign* productions of the same class. The total submergence of its peculiarities then was imminent, and would have been irreparable, within the area of Cleveland, but for the discerning labours of the Vicar of Danby. These peculiarities are mainly of Scandinavian origin. For the Danes in the ninth and tenth centuries did a great deal more than take formal possession of that part of the Anglian domain. They peopled it effectually; and people it, in their descendants, to this hour. This could be surely inferred, if other evidence were lacking, from the character of many transmitted popular customs and beliefs. A wedding in Cleveland is still to some extent in fact, what it is in Norway in name—a 'bride-race' (*Bryl-lup*, equivalent to *Braut-lauf*). The ceremonies of 'marriage by capture,' it is true, survive very faintly, and will before long have ceased to survive at all. But foot-races, the dwindled representatives of the steeple-chase to the bride's door of days gone by, are still run for ribbons given by the bride; and the antique, if less significant, custom of drinking the 'bride-ale,' is probably even now respected in out-of-the-way villages by the production and consumption of sundry 'hot-pots' on the return journey of the wedding party from church.

A corresponding word to 'bridal' (bride-ale) is the Yorkshire and Norse 'arval,' i.e. heir-ale. 'More honoured,' indeed, 'in the breach than in the observance' was the Scandinavian practice of holding a grand carouse in honour of the heir's succession to his father's estates, replaced, in our northern counties, by a funeral feast on a scale commensurate with the dignity of the deceased. The guests invited on these by no means mournful occasions might, not uncommonly, number three hundred; and the beef and bacon set on the groaning board were to be estimated by the hundredweight. But the proportions of these colossal repasts are on the wane. Formerly, in connexion with them, 'arval-bread,' made with spice and currants—evidently another form of

cross-buns—was distributed to the poor; of late, 'funeral-biscuits,' served with wine to the departing company, have been substituted.

The fairies of Cleveland combine the characteristics of the 'tripping elves' of the South with those of Northern trolls and goblins. They are practical and energetic little people. They

'make and wash butter, and even tub it, or put it down for keeping; wash their linen industriously, nay, even noisily; fire their bolts at animals; dance around the fairy ring; are capable of inflicting mischief on mankind; take charge of deserted children, rear them to manhood, protect them through life, and bury them when dead; abstract children; stand in need of the services of human midwives; resist the building of churches, destroying the work done in the day and *flitting* the materials to a spot less objectionable to themselves by night; haunt certain tumuli or howes as their chosen residence; live underground, and the like.' (*Cleveland Glossary*, p. 18.)

The various elements they embody were perhaps originally furnished by the benignant white and the malignant black spirits of the air and earth respectively. Some criteria for distinguishing them are provided in the 'Cleveland Glossary.' Thus, only true elves dance

'While overhead the moon
Sits arbitress.'

But the practice of handicrafts or manual operations belongs of right to the troll kind of being. They too are alone responsible for the abduction of children, although grown-up men or women may be detained in fairyland by 'black 'spirits or white, blue spirits or grey.' Trolls, on the other hand, are unacquainted with the peculiar description of archery in vogue among elves. Prehistoric stone implements are, in many parts of the world, associated with supernatural agencies. They come from the sky, it is widely believed, and in Germany require seven or nine years to reach the surface of the ground, from the depth to which they had been driven by the impetus of their fall. When found they may, under discreet guidance, be turned to manifold account. They avail, for instance, to increase the productiveness of milch cows, to cure juvenile ailments, and to avert the stroke of lightning. Imitations of them serve the Greeks as amulets, and are strung into luck-bringing necklaces in Bosnia.* In Northern Europe those of the axe shape rank as thunderbolts, or 'Thor's hammers,' flint

* Boyd Dawkins, 'Early Man in B tain,' p. 336.

arrowheads as 'elf darts.' Such are the weapons fabricated by the Yorkshire elves and mischievously discharged against cattle, with the result of producing attacks curable, like the wound of Telephus, only with the instrument of its infliction. The affected animal is either touched with an 'awf shot,' or made to drink water in which one has been dipped. Similarly, in Scandinavian countries, a beast suddenly struck down by sickness is unhesitatingly pronounced to be 'elf shot.'

In the childhood of Danby folk now decrepit, the fairies had a 'desper't haunt o' thae hillsides just ahint the public' at Fairy Cross Plains. There the rings where they danced were the largest and best kept to be seen for miles around, and it was a favourite pastime with children to run round and round in them, taking good care, however, to stop short of completing a ninefold circuit. Otherwise—and the persuasion was deeply rooted—the watchful elves, always eager to secure human prisoners, would have been enabled to remove the overbold runner to their own abodes there to dwell in durance for aye. The avenue to those abodes was by an adjacent culvert, where the 'moonshine revellers,' represented by 'a little green man with a queer sort of a 'hat on him,' had many a time and oft been seen to disappear. But here the husband of the old lady acting as our author's informant interposed the query, 'Why, where do they 'live, then?' 'Why, under t' grund, to be sure.' 'Nay, 'nay,' says the hoary sceptic, 'how can they live under t' 'grund?' The rejoinder was prompt and proved conclusive. 'Why, the moudiwarps (moles) does, and why not 'the fairies?'

Among the diversified ranks of those who

> 'run
> By the triple Hecate's team'

the Yorkshire 'hobs' are pre-eminent for the odd *grittiness* (so to speak) of their personality. The portraiture of dwarfs is usually more individual than that of fairies, and hobs are pretty closely akin to

> 'that pygmean race
> Beyond the Indian mount.'

They resemble the trows of Shetland in being of the male sex only, but are untroubled by their hankering after human wives. At Unst,* and by the Fitful Head, it is well

* Mrs. Saxby, 'Home of a Naturalist,' p. 194.

known that girl-babies need to be secured by very special precautions from being spirited away to the weird realm of those who

'follow darkness like a dream;'

while among the Dales Heads they are comparatively safe—hobs being far more perfectly 'exempt from ladies' than trows. Nor do they form so well-marked a race. They have, indeed, properly speaking, no collective existence. Each is an individual apart, localised and specialised in separately rooted traditions. The nineteenth century has been too much for them; yet they were, on the whole, well-intentioned and helpful beings, whose improvement off the face of the earth is much to be deplored. One who dwelt in a cave at Runswick was in high repute for curing the whooping cough. Parents were accustomed to take their children to the residence of the elfin doctor, invoking his aid in the following simple formula:—

'Hob-hole Hob! Mah bairn's gettin' t'kin' cough:
Tak' 't off! Tak' 't off!'

A still more serviceable hob was he of Hart Hall, in Glaisdale. Lucky was the farmer whose hay, in a 'catchy' time, he interested himself in saving. No room was left for misgivings about the result. When all seemed on the point of being lost, then the sturdy sprite mysteriously came to the rescue. He was not, indeed, to be counted upon as an ordinary farm hand, but reserved himself chiefly for emergencies. 'What mortal strength was clearly incapable of,' that was the work which Hob took upon himself.' His disappearance ensued upon an injudicious attempt to recompense his exertions. One moonlit night a spying boy discerned him, through a chink in the barn door, as a 'little brown man, a' covered wi' hair, spangin' about wi' 'the flail like one mad.' He was poorly clad in 'a ragged 'sort of a sark,' and the Hart Hall folk, fearing he must suffer from the severe cold of those winter nights, considerately, though unluckily, bethought themselves of providing him with warmer clothing. So a garment was constructed, as like to his own as might be, only of better stuff, and laid before nightfall in the barn—'gay and handy for the little 'chap to notice' when next he came. But, alas! the effect was equally unwelcome and unexpected. The hob, who had hitherto shown himself perfectly disinterested, could not brook the insult implied by so shabby an offering. His wounded feelings found vent in rhyme, and an indignant

couplet declared at once his contempt for the offending vesture and his intention (but too punctually fulfilled) of 'cooming nae mair' to wield his potent, if shadowy, flail. No other result could, in fact, have been anticipated, since 'elves, hobs, and fairies' are notoriously never seen twice by mortal eyes. And so, in this 'drudging goblin,' a highly economical form of machine came to a standstill in Cleveland.

A much less eligible familiar was the 'Farndale Hob,' about whom Professor Phillips tells a story, well known in Danish folklore, and at home also in Lancashire. His impish tricks were long endured by the farmer specially singled out as their victim, but at last grew to such a pitch that removal from Farndale was determined upon as the only means of escape from the torment they inflicted.

'Early in the morning,' accordingly, 'as he was on his way, with his household goods in a cart, a neighbour meeting him said, "Ah sees thou's flitting." "Ay," cries Hob out of the churn, "ay, we'se flittin'." On which the farmer, concluding that change of abode would not rid him of his troublesome inmate, turned his horse's head homeward again.'

Dr. Atkinson animadverts upon some obvious incongruities in the professor's version of the incident, and chiefly upon the incredible levity with which the important and half-executed project of a 'flitting' was abandoned on the discovery that the household tormentor reckoned as part of the household furniture, all the attendant difficulties of the *revocare gradum* being quietly ignored. About the substantial genuineness and antiquity of the little legend, however, there can be no manner of doubt.

Another, but a harmless, specimen of the same class was called, from his chosen residence, a cave in the Mulgrave Woods, 'Hobtrush Hob.'* He was inaccessible to callers, not from any avowed unwillingness to receive them, but owing to the invariably unfinished state of his toilet at the moment of their approach. He was always engaged, just then, in the critical operation of 'tying on his left foot 'shoe,' and in spite of his professed polite expectation to the contrary, it never got actually completed until after their departure.† Hence, Hobtrush Hob remained a *nominis umbra* to the last.

---

* 'Hob' is a corruption of Robin, as 'Hodge' of Roger. Skeat, 'Etymological Dictionary,' *Hob.*

† Cleveland Glossary, p. 263.

'Fifty years ago,' our author remarks, 'the whole atmo-
'sphere of the folklore firmament in this district was so
'surcharged with the being and the works of the witch,
'that one seemed able to trace her presence and her activity
'in almost every nook and corner of the neighbourhood.'
The black art was omnipresent to the popular imagination; tales of sorcery and diabolical transformations were rife, and are probably still recounted at old-fashioned firesides. But the most 'noted witches' have ceased from troubling, and their exploits figure mainly in traditions. They related predominantly to the abstraction of milk and the injuring of cattle—a point upon which Yorkshire farmers feel very sensibly—and were accomplished, not infrequently, under the appearance of a glowering and obviously uncanny hare. The prominence of this animal in witch stories is not peculiar to Danby. Those met with not only on the Scottish Border, but even in Dorsetshire, include the same relationship.

The accusations they involved were not wholly gratuitous. Their heroines were, for the most part, malevolent hags, besides being professed sorceresses; and the profession was, at any rate in some parts of the world, connected with frightful impieties. Nay, they really exercised some obscure, apparently preternatural, influence of the nature, in Mr. Atkinson's opinion, of animal magnetism, and exercised it for evil purposes. So that they were far from being spotlessly innocent of the crimes imputed to them. Among these avarice was not conspicuous. The Weird Sisters of the Dales were more malicious than mercenary; whereas the 'Wise 'Man,' pitted against the witch, traded freely upon the credulity of his dupes. His charms, though efficacious, were costly. 'Witch-wood,' on the other hand, procured by private initiative, afforded an economical, if scarcely so secure a remedy. It might be a case of 'penny wise, pound 'foolish.' For the conditions upon which its potency against the spells of the evil-disposed depended were somewhat complicated. Naturally, to begin with, it should be cut from the rowan, or mountain ash; but not with the first handy implement, or at any convenient time or season. Only with a household knife, and only on St. Helen's day, should the lopping be done. Nor was every rowan tree available as a source of supply. One previously unknown to the operator could alone furnish the desired antidote. Witch-wood, then, to be truly invincible, had to be sought far afield. Moreover, a different route was prescribed for bringing it home from that followed in the quest for it.

The neglect of this final precaution might mar the whole purpose of the expedition.

'Whether these conditions,' Dr. Atkinson remarks (p. 99), 'were always and punctiliously observed by the devout believers in the power of the witch, and in the prophylactic efficacy of the witch-wood, I am not able from positive knowledge or information to affirm; but I am quite well aware that the consumption of the article in question was by no means small, and that, too, even within the period of my personal acquaintance with the district.

'But there were other means of anticipating or obviating such harm and loss, and not a few, besides these already mentioned. Thus, I knew an old lady—a dear, canny old body she was—who, before she proceeded to churn, invariably took forcible measures to expel the witch, or any witch emissary, who might, in the malice of her intention, have lodged herself in the churn. And this she did by proceeding to throw one pinch of salt into the fire and another into the churn, repeating the alternate sprinkling until the mystic number of nine times for each had been completed. Another and not ineffectual method on the like occasion was—in order, I suppose, to make the place too hot to hold the witch—to take the kitchen poker, heated to an unmistakable red heat, and, inserting it at the opening or bunghole, to turn it slowly round, sweeping as wide a space as possible within the said utensil, nine several times. Witch-wood, too, had its allotted station in the dairy, and in connexion with the various dairy vessels. So that, on the whole, the witches must have had a hard time of it to get in, and it would almost seem, having somehow or other got in, a harder time still to maintain the position they had won. But, on conning over the old woman's recipe for the gathering of effectually serviceable witch-wood, we see there was a good deal to think of, and a good deal to be very punctilious over, and that a lapse in any one of the particulars named might easily be fatal to the virtue of the whole season's stock of the article.'

Considering, too, the anguish of surviving doubt and the driving power of blind fear, it is scarcely surprising that the Wise Man, or anti-conjuror, had numerous clients, and drove a roaring trade.

'Society,' according to Emerson, 'never advances; it recedes as fast on one side as it gains on the other.' We should be sorry to think that the 'process of the suns' brought so little benefit to the 'heirs of all the ages;' yet it must be confessed that, in the matter of superstition, each class of society dwells in its own glass house. The highest culture and the most abject credulity are, indeed, at the lofty stage of civilisation reached by our world, particularly apt to be combined. 'All the fables of the Legend, and the Talmud, and the Alcoran' might with ease be imposed upon the 'theosophic' mind; 'esoteric' religion deals in narra-

tives, if anything, more improbable, and certainly less romantically wild, than those of witches' rides to Blaakulla or the Brocken; and there is little to choose, in point of feasibility, between transportation on a broomstick and conveyance in the shape of an 'astral body' to a remote goal of pilgrimage. The mystical and the marvellous have lost none of their antique attractiveness. 'Double gangers' may be met at London dinner parties; mediums and charlatans do not lack customers for their unsubstantial wares; psychical influences pervade clubs and boudoirs; premonitions are noted with eager faith; divination and fortune-telling are practised, *secundum artem*, in the best society. *Qui vult decipi, decipiatur.* And all these more or less noxious follies are but ripples on the surface of a dark pool of genuine iniquity, the depths of which, if report speaks truly, are being sounded in other centres of contemporary civilisation, as they have been sounded at various epochs of the past.

The value, meanwhile, of the record of rustic phases of life and thought supplied by 'Forty Years in a Moorland Parish' is great, and will continually increase. It has been written not a day too soon. Forty years hence, most of the lore embalmed in it would have sunk too far out of sight for recovery by the most skilful and curious inquirer. Its author is, then, to be congratulated on the timely opportunities placed at his disposal; yet still more on the patience, industry, and ability by which he has been enabled to turn them to account. The reading public, too, is to be congratulated on the possession of a book really deserving the name, because conveying original information in a highly agreeable and appropriate style.

ART. III.—*A History of the 'Old Water-Colour Society,' now the Royal Society of Painters in Water Colours.* By JOHN LEWIS ROGET. Two Volumes. 8vo. London: 1891.

IT is to be regretted that the author of this work has adopted a title and a treatment of the subject which convey an inadequate impression of its real value and importance. It might well have been styled a 'History of Water-Colour 'Painting' in England, which is a desideratum in the annals of British art; and if Mr. Roget had not been trammelled by the proceedings of the 'Old Water-Colour Society,' in which we feel no particular interest, he might have given us a broader and more complete account of a branch of art which has been invented and carried to perfection in this country within the last hundred years, and in which alone the artists of England stand pre-eminent. But we must be thankful for what we have got, and we are indebted to Mr. Roget for tracing, with biographical minuteness, the humble origin and gradual developement of the School of Water-Colour Painting, which is one of the glories of this country, since it has produced works that rival in beauty and in actual value the best pictures of this century.

Mr. Roget explains at starting that the idea of writing this work did not originate with himself. Early in 1852, Mr. Joseph J. Jenkins, at that time secretary of the Old Society of Painters in Water Colours, announced, by an advertisement in the 'Times' newspaper, his purpose of writing and publishing a 'History of the English School of 'Painters in Water Colours, with examples illustrative of 'its progress, and biographical notices of the most eminent 'professors of the art.' At the same time he asked for information which might help him in the earlier, and, in some sense, the most important, part of his task, and requested his friends to furnish him especially with any notes throwing light on the history of the material and on the lives of the chief pioneers and artists of the new schools. With all his efforts the book was not finished, and was, perhaps, not very far advanced when he died in 1885. His health had long been poor, and his ordinary work tended to confine his researches to the circle of the Society to which he had attached himself. 'Thus,' Mr. Roget remarks, 'the materials 'he left were more fitted for constructing a history of the 'Old Water-Colour Society than one of the wider scope 'originally announced.' We cannot see the force of the

reason, and we think that the modifications made in Mr. Jenkins's plan will with many be a matter of regret. Mr. Roget, it seems, saw Mr. Jenkins only once, a few months before his death. At this meeting Mr. Jenkins explained to him the nature of his projected book, and afterwards he sent to Mr. Roget such manuscripts as he had had time and strength to prepare.

The quantity of material so supplied was not large, and it consisted chiefly of biographical notes relating to members of the Water-Colour Society, and to some who lived and died before the Society came into existence. In short, Mr. Jenkins had not been able to do more than bring together a number of fragments, all more or less incomplete. There was nothing, we are told, in the shape of a narrative giving a history of the Society or of the school or schools which preceded and led to its formation. In some instances, Mr. Jenkins had collected much valuable matter not hitherto published about the men whose works pushed on the developement of the new art; in others the record was a mere blank. To put them out in the form of a collection or commonplace book of literary and artistic notes was not to be thought of, and Mr. Roget resolved on compiling 'a 'history of sufficient scope to comprehend it all.' With this great task he determined to grapple; but, unfortunately, he was not prepared to undertake the compilation of a complete history of water-colour art. This change or restriction of plan has, as it seems to us, been suggested by fears which may almost be dismissed as visionary. Mr. Roget is, indeed, aware that, after all, his book is not merely what it professes to be—a history of the Old Water-Colour Society. He has not, he says, confined himself to the bare task of relating its proceedings or giving the lives of its members.

'Taking advantage of its acknowledged representative position, I have considered its annals as forming an integral part of the history of water-colour painting in England, and have endeavoured to define its relations with other co-existent bodies and with the general world of art. As, moreover, the parentage and descent, as well as the birth of the subject, are usually recorded in a biographical memoir, so I have included some account not only of the immediate events which led to the founding of the Society of Painters in Water Colours, but of its remoter origin in the practice of water-colour art during the eighteenth century. In this preliminary history of the School notices will be found of the leading draftsmen of the former period.'

This is virtually an admission that the departure from Mr. Jenkins's plan was an error of judgement. Mr,

Jenkins purposed to give biographical notices of the most prominent painters, but he seems never to have thought of giving memoirs of all. Mr. Roget has committed himself to this task of writing the lives of its older 'and of all deceased 'members and associates;' and the results are in more than one sense unhappy. Not only have some of the memoirs a very slight interest, and some of them none whatever, but the notices are in many cases out of all proportion to the importance of the subject. It is unnecessary to tell us that the eldest brother of Frederick Tayler 'was for some years 'a chaplain in India, and afterwards became rector of Stoke 'Newington;' but it becomes a severe tax on our patience when we find fifteen pages taken up with the memoir of George Chambers. This able painter had, undoubtedly, to fight with tremendous difficulties. His powers were great, his success was striking, and his death at the age of thirty-seven cut short a career of very high promise; but all that we need to know might have been told in four or five pages at the utmost.

The effect of Mr. Roget's method on the character of his work generally is more to be regretted than the swelling of its size by superfluous matter. There was no reason why one knot of men should be made to stand out with a prominence denied to all others. There was no need of the air of superiority and exclusiveness which imparts a flavour of controversy to a large part of this history. What are spoken of as secessions or desertions from other societies to the ranks of that which Mr. Roget always speaks of as 'our 'society,' might have been lightly passed over, and in most cases not mentioned at all. The arrangement proposed by Mr. Jenkins would really have saved much space, and we greatly doubt whether a fairly complete history of the art of water-colour painting in this country might not have been given in the compass of two volumes less ponderous than those of Mr. Roget. As it is, we have a vast amount of information about individual artists for which we do not much care, and little notice, or none, of many great painters, because they belonged to other societies, or because they chiefly or largely worked in oils. A great opportunity has, we think, been lost, and the result is a work which leaves much more to be done. All that we need say further on this point is that the subject might have been treated as a whole, and without the constant interruptions and recapitulations rendered necessary by the chronological arrangement which Mr. Roget has found it convenient to adopt,

Such a treatment would have secured a more cordial welcome of his book. As it now stands, we have a sufficiently full account of Girtin, but very little of Turner, because the latter, in his capacity as a painter in oils, joined the ranks of the Royal Academy. Mr. Roget is, of course, obliged to speak of him as one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of water-colour painters; and the faultiness of his method is thus brought home to us at the outset. What we want to know is how the several influences at work in the last century tended to bring about one special result, that result being the developement of a form of art which must be spoken of as the peculiar growth of English thought and feeling. This new art has created a strong enthusiasm on the part both of the artists and of those who have enjoyed their works, and the course of its developement has shown a steady and systematic perseverance in meeting and beating down difficulties, with results of which Englishmen are proud, but at which French critics seem tempted only to wonder. After seeing the collection of English water-colour pictures in the Paris Exhibition of 1855, M. About came deliberately to the conclusion that the art was not worth the time and trouble spent upon it.

'Les artistes qui se donnent tant de peine pour faire avec de l'eau ce qu'ils feraient aisément avec de l'huile, ressemblent à ces amants romanesques qui entrent par la cheminée quand la porte est ouverte à deux battants. "Oui, mais l'aquarelle est un genre national." Lorsque je vois l'aquarelle viser à la couleur et prétendre aux grands effets, je crois rencontrer une jeune et jolie pensionnaire qui s'enfuit de son couvent sous des habits de mousquetaire. Je crains enfin que les peintres d'aquarelle ne sacrifient leur gloire à venir à leur popularité présente. Car enfin les aquarelles, quoiqu'elles se conservent plus longtemps que les confitures, ne sauraient durer autant que les tableaux.' (Vol. ii. p. 90.)

To us it seems that this judgement is over-hasty, and that these sentences take scant account of facts. Paintings in oils may fade, and have faded, while the cartoons of Raphael, after some centuries, still retain not a little of their first splendour, to show what may be done with some of the processes applicable to paper. To speak of impossibilities in water colours as being practicable, or even easy, in oils is merely to prejudge the case. Each probably has its own unsurpassable excellences, and when we remember that we are comparing the powers of an art invented but as yesterday against the achievement of another whose history stretches back at least over many centuries, it may be

doubted whether so rapid a growth as that of British water-colour painting can be paralleled elsewhere. Nor need we fear to say that, of those who were the most persevering and the most sanguine in struggling on against the difficulties connected with the materials and vehicles at their command, not one would have ventured to think that success so rapid and so complete was to be even hoped for.

The earlier portion of this history Mr. Roget has, on the whole, treated admirably; and the merits of these introductory chapters confirm in us the impression that he would have found no insuperable difficulty in carrying out Mr. Jenkins's plan more exactly. To be told that the splendours of our best water-colour painting can be traced back to mere topography may, for those who have not given attention to the subject, seem incredible. Yet it is clear that mere figure painting—or painting in which everything is subordinated to the effect of the figures—will never lead to the cultivation of landscape art—that is, to the representation of all that may be seen on the earth and in the air. But topography of some sort or other has been a necessity ever since the human mind worked out the principles of geometry. Even the medieval charts strain after something more than flat lineal representation. Rude likenesses of individual objects are introduced in the spots where they would be found, but without the least attempt to connect them with any perspective. After this fashion the map became, in course of time, a bird's-eye view, and the work in this stage began to call for something like artistic perspective. The men who drew these views, and who were generally their own engravers, wished to make their productions as attractive as possible—in other words, they sought, whether consciously or not, after beauty. Another feeling, deeply rooted in humanity, gave a strong impulse in the same direction. The trouble spent on making the figures of a bird's-eye map or view might give more than the hard outlines of a single house or castle. The great and the wealthy were always desirous of having likenesses of themselves for their descendants; and a like feeling led them to desire likenesses of the houses in which they lived, for their own satisfaction as well as for that of their children. In the early part of the last century such drawings were crude indeed. Still the publishers of 'Britannia Illustrata' appealed directly to the pride of rank and wealth when, before sending out the third volume, they issued a notice that 'there is a third volume in hand; any

'gentleman paying five guineas towards the graving may 'have their seat inserted, it being very forward, which is 'only half what the former paid.' The views so published are, in Mr. Roget's words, 'no more amenable to the laws of 'composition than the publisher's announcement was to 'those of grammar.' In many of these pictures three horizons are combined—one for the house or other prominent structure, a second for the distant landscape, and a third for the living figures or other objects seen in the foreground. In spite of this incongruous jumble, these works have a curious air of reality. The draftsman has set down the plantations, the avenues, the roads, and the carriages and passengers who passed along them. The drawings are, in short, full of matter. 'Guests at the grand 'house play bowls on the green sward; the master mounts 'his hunter for a run with the hounds; pasture and arable 'land are duly distinguished by herds and flocks and harvest 'scenes; deer are in the park; and heavy wains, with long-'drawn teams, rumble along the high roads.' The forms and figures being all drawn as they appeared to the draftsman's eye, the whole is strictly a piece of historical topography; and this is more than can be said for a work so magnificent as Turner's 'Heidelberg,' where neither men nor hills nor river appear as they can ever be seen there.

Accident, or that which seems such, often gives a new direction to impulses already at work. The drawings from which are taken the engravings published in such works as the 'Britannia Illustrata' had no value whatever except as 'copy' for the engraver. Multiplication of plates was the one object of the publisher, who had to repay himself for his outlay; and, obviously, no real change could be brought about unless the drawing could in some way acquire a value of its own. In the middle of the last century two brothers were settled at Windsor, both of whom had been sent on business errands to Scotland. The elder, Thomas Sandby, had been appointed draftsman to the chief engineer in Scotland, and brought to the Government the earliest tidings of the landing of Charles Edward. After the suppression of the insurrection the younger brother, Paul, was sent to make surveys in the northern and western Highlands for the roads which the Government proposed to make or to improve. He did his work for his employers, but he gave such leisure as he could get to the task of sketching the country with the magnificence of which he was greatly impressed. After joining his brother at Windsor, Paul gave himself vigorously

to the work for which he had abandoned his post under the Government. Sketching everything in the neighbourhood, he showed the power, which he had gained during his Scottish sojourn, of imparting something like beauty, as well as accuracy, even to drawings more or less strictly topographical. But others, as well as Paul Sandby, saw the need of concerted action, if systematic progress was to be made. There is no reason for supposing that Sandby had anything to do with the subscription studio in Peter's Court, St. Martin's Lane, founded by Hogarth; but when in 1753 an effort was made to establish an academy of painting, sculpture, and architecture, the fact that a copy of the prospectus was sent to Paul Sandby showed the standing which he had acquired as an artist. Later on, Hogarth and the Sandbys are found acting together; but the object now was not so much to set up an academy for teaching as to establish an exhibition for the works of professional painters. The first association formed for this purpose split into two societies. Of these the association to which the leading men attached themselves held its exhibition in a room in Spring Gardens, and was incorporated by Royal Charter in 1765. But this did not prevent another split; and the leading members, among whom were the two Sandbys, not only succeeded in forming a new society, but, managing to get the King's more immediate patronage, became the founders of the existing Royal Academy.

These movements went far towards accomplishing the revolution which Sandby had seen to be necessary. If drawings or pictures were to be exhibited to the public, it must be on the score, not of their usefulness for the multiplication of engravings, but for their intrinsic beauty. The relative positions of the drawing and the engraving were inverted. The possession of the former became the great object of ambition; the latter, although the work of the engraver was yet to be immeasurably advanced, became secondary. But the materials on which the water-colour draftsman had to work were unsatisfactory enough. Mr. Roget gives a letter written in 1767 by Gainsborough, who, living then at Bath, asks Mr. Dodsley to send him some of the paper on which the fifth edition of Anstey's 'New Bath Guide' was printed. 'I wish,' says the great painter, 'that one 'of my landskips, such as I could make you upon that paper, 'would prove a sufficient inducement for you to make still 'further inquiry.' The conclusion follows that Sandby was confined for his drawings to the common thin writing paper

of the time, and to such pigments as he could make for himself. Using chiefly vegetable colours, he drew his outlines with a reed pen; but in his later work this outline grew less and less pronounced, while, by repeating his tints, he gained strength for his foreground.

It must not, however, be forgotten that very much was done for the advancement of water-colour art by the generous aid of wealthy and far-seeing critics. Sandby's Windsor drawings came before the great naturalist, Sir Joseph Banks, who not only bought seventy-five (many of which now are in the Royal collection at Windsor), but by taking him to North Wales renewed the enthusiasm which had been awakened in him by the mountain forms of Scotland. Of the pictures which Sandby produced under the inspiration of these new scenes, Mr. Roget says that they suffice to show

'how much too low a place in the history of art is given to Sandby by those who say that his landscapes did not get beyond mere topography. Besides effective and graceful drawing, there is a natural freshness in the rural scenes; and trees and foliage are depicted with truth and beauty rarely equalled by more modern artists. . . . In these aquatints of Sandby's there may, perhaps, be recognised an early foreshadowing of Turner's great work, the "Liber Studiorum."'

The taste for topographical drawings had not indeed died away; and about this time it received an impetus from an unexpected quarter. In 1773 the great Staffordshire potters, Wedgwood and Bentley, were requested by the Empress Catherine of Russia to prepare a cream-ware service 'for 'every purpose of the table,' on every one of which was to be enamelled a view of 'British scenery.' Not one of them was to be repeated; and the number of pieces was not less than 1282. On receiving this startling commission, Wedgwood said that 'all the gardens in England would not 'furnish subjects sufficient.' He was, it need scarcely be said, profoundly unconscious of the real beauties of Great Britain; but, determined not to fail, he, with his partner, sent persons with a camera obscura to take views, and ransacked the printshops 'for the most embellished views, the 'most beautiful landskips, with Gothique ruins, Grecian 'temples, and the most elegant buildings' to be found within the realms. The set, when completed, was exhibited for two months before it was sent off to Russia; and it was found that representations of country houses, parks, and gardens, the staple of the old topographical drawing, formed a prominent part of it. The fashion thus set was sedulously

followed. Wedgwood found that, by including their seats in his series, he would have it in his power 'to pay some 'acceptable compliments in that way.' So great, indeed, was the satisfaction expressed by the families of Staffordshire that Wedgwood believed he could make it worth his while 'to pursue the same plan all over the kingdom.' The current ran for a long time in this direction, the effect being to give a great impulse to the art of line-engraving in the representation of landscape. This method had been followed with great success by William Woollett, and was more fully developed by Byrne, Hearne, and others who followed him. Still more beneficial was the influence of Gainsborough, of whom Mr. Roget rightly speaks as 'a thoroughly English 'artist.' Gainsborough was, indeed, essentially a painter in oils; but his letter to Mr. Dodsley already cited shows how anxious he was to obtain a good material for his water-colour sketches or landscapes. In fact, he had an intense appreciation of the beauty of transparent colour. 'Had he 'lived,' says Mr. Roget, 'to learn the fulness and depth with 'which water colours could be used, he would have hailed 'the discovery with especial delight.' In the very pleasant chapters which deal with this period Mr. Roget gives it as his settled belief that 'if the love of landscape-sketching, 'which has long distinguished English amateurs, and in 'our day remains as prevalent as ever, is to be traced 'to the influence of an individual, that one is probably 'Gainsborough.'

The influence of Gainsborough was carried on through Dr. Thomas Monro, one of the most judicious as well as generous guides and patrons who have befriended painters in the difficulties and discouragements of their early career. Competent judges said of some of his sketches that they would not easily be distinguished from those of Gainsborough. Among the young men whom he thus aided the most prominent were two who may be looked upon as the true founders of modern English water-colour art—Girtin and Turner. We need not repeat here what we have already said* of the work of the latter, its motives, its aims, its method, and its results. The one died within the life-time of men who still retain their full vigour; the other barely more than lived into the present century, and when he died had scarcely completed his third decade. The two

* Hamerton's 'Life of Turner.' 'Edinburgh Review,' January, 1880.

men differed widely from each other in tastes, in character, and in habits; and, had Girtin lived, it is quite as possible that there might have been a breach between them as that their so-called friendship would have been continued. It seems certain that Turner never felt for Girtin that which is ordinarily meant by the term 'friendship.' Turner was as reserved as Girtin was candid. With Turner his art was from first to last a mystery. He would allow no one to see him work, and he would never tell others how he worked. Girtin had no secrets, and in this showed that he stood morally and intellectually on immeasurably higher ground. Turner, it is said, always expressed a great admiration for Girtin. As to what Girtin thought of Turner we are ignorant. Under Dr. Monro's roof they came together for the purpose of work. Youth and a common enthusiasm for art made the time so spent, doubtless, pleasant enough; but beyond this we can say little. In Dr. Monro they had assuredly a true friend; and Dr. Monro may not have thought that the sketches and effects of black and white which they did for him were more than a recompense for the halfcrown and the good supper with which he requited them. Of the bargain between them more than one version is given, and we may note that neither Girtin nor Turner seems to have been dissatisfied. When Dr. Monro's collection was sold in 1833, Turner, it is said, told Dr. Burney, who admired the drawings made under this compact, that 'perhaps they were not so bad for half a crown and one's 'oysters.' Both the young men were, it seems, not unwilling to eke out their gains by the old process of colouring engravings; in other words, by availing themselves of what had been supposed to be the true end and purpose of water-colour drawing. In times past transparent pigments had been valued solely because they might be laid on engravings without blurring or putting out of sight the strokes of the engraver, although, as the printsellers sometimes said, not much harm would have been done if they were hidden. For the present a common zeal for art kept the two young men together. They sketched along the shores of the Thames—at Westminster, Lambeth, and Chelsea, while these places were still full of irregular and picturesque forms, which have now been swept away by the rigid lines of embankments, and parapets, and masses of hewn stone. It is perhaps too much to say, as some have said, that the two students followed precisely opposite methods in their work—that Girtin took his own course from the first, this course being a faithful,

patient, and truthful rendering of what he saw before him; while Turner studied the works of other painters for the purpose of beating all of them on their own ground, and that 'it was not until he had tried his hand against every 'painter that he formed his own distinctive style.' At that early age Turner could scarcely have put before himself the idea of this antagonism under such extremely definite conditions; but the truth is that, as he worked, he was studying not less than Girtin—studying especially effects of air and light, and, indeed, all the phenomena of the visible heavens and the visible earth, not for any purposes of mere topographical accuracy, but to shed a peculiar glory on every subject with which he chose to deal, and so to place before the spectator, not that which he would see, but that which he ought to see.

Like Paul Sandby, Girtin, going thither as the companion of Mr. J. Moore, was greatly impressed with the grandeur, as well as the beauty, of Scotch scenery, and also with that of the north of England. This acquaintance with new forms and new effects led to a great change in the character of his work, and to a vast increase of power in the representation of mountain masses under the deep gloom of overhanging cloud and mist. All that he now produced continued to show this widening range of his thought, until the disease which finally conquered him arrested the action of his hands. His method of working has been described with so much minuteness as to make us suspicious of its accuracy, even when we remember the candour and openness of his character. We are told, for instance, that an accident made him aware of the mode of wiping out lights in water-colour paintings. Girtin, however, is said to have accomplished this by means of water, Turner by the use of bread. Mr. Jenkins is disposed to give Turner the credit of some discovery for the taking out of lights. But the point is not material. The methods of recovering lights on paper darkened by colour must sooner or later have been found out by a body of men all working on the same substance. We do not pretend to determine precisely the measure in which the developement of water-colour painting was pushed on by any one man. Girtin freed himself from most of the conventionalities by which he found the practice of the art trammelled. He softened, if he did not get rid of, the hard black pencilled outlines which had been looked upon as an indispensable help to the draftsman; nor would he hold himself bound to adhere to the mechanical and stereotyped

order by which the laying on of a certain number of washes was supposed to render the work complete. But the emancipation was not thorough, and from the openness, which was his great characteristic, his pupils and his imitators carried away from him practices which with them degenerated into a knack of getting up drawings in 'Girtin's style;' and so the man, who had been fighting as hard as he could against dry and barren conventionalism, acquired to some extent the reputation of a mannerist.

It is more likely that from Girtin came the first suggestion for the formation of the sketching clubs which have awakened so much zeal and given so much wholesome pleasure to their members, and, through these, to their friends. He was, probably, only carrying out an idea suggested by the conditions under which he had worked for Dr. Monro's half-crowns and suppers. They met in town at the house of one of the members, the host supplying strained paper, colours, and pencils, and retaining as his own property all the sketches made during the evening. This little knot of students included some who, in after years, rose to high eminence, among them being Robert Ker Porter, Augustus Wall Calcott, and John Sell Cotman. Girtin's bodily strength was fast failing him when he exhibited an oil-painting of Bolton Bridge at the Royal Academy in 1801. He wished, it is said, to become a member of that body, which declined to regard as painters those who worked in water colours only. Turner had already found his way into it as an associate; and he was elected R.A. in 1802, the year of Girtin's death. Both had already given a splendid earnest of greater work to follow in time to come; and, had both lived, the only thing which we can affirm with any confidence is that their courses would not have run in parallel lines. In the opinion of Mr. Jenkins, Turner, at the beginning of the present century, was the more careful and painstaking, Girtin the more vigorous and stronger in colour. In the judgement of William Havell, a painter of extraordinary power, both were great experimentalists in rendering paper and water colours subservient to the impression of light, shrinking from no trick to secure the end desired. Thus Turner used to cut out figures in paper and paste them on his drawing; and both sought to get gradation by pumping water over their work. It can scarcely be said that such practices are illegitimate, unless they are likely to affect the durability of the picture. If it be true that Turner, for instance, cared for nothing but immediate

effects, and knowingly employed combinations of pigments which could not fail to be hurtful, he was injuring the future possessors of his works. Otherwise there seems to be no reason why Turner should not have the benefit of his own rule, which placed on the artist no restriction beyond the duty of knowing what he had to do and then doing it.

It is certainly true that in order to get perfect gradation Turner was ready to make any practicable sacrifice. Mr. Roget quotes the opinion of Mr. Pye, that in Turner gradation was the governing power, while in Girtin the governing power lay in the parts, the aim after gradation being secondary; and that hence gradation with the former began from the marginal line of the foreground, with the latter when he had gone about halfway to the horizon. It follows that his gradation was not so complete as that of Turner; but it may be doubted whether Girtin would have felt himself justified in resorting to Turner's device of interposing a vast atmospheric distance between two tolerably near portions of a single object, as in the familiar instance of the great stone pine in the foreground of the 'Golden Bough.' It is, however, not less certain that Girtin, as well as Turner, gave a strong impulse to work in the right direction by spending all their strength on the perfect representation of light and shade in connexion with or apart from local colour. William Havell was beyond doubt right when he spoke of Turner as being 'the first of the water-colour 'draftsmen who aimed at making the eye of the spectator 'look into the subject of the drawing beyond the surface of 'the paper on which it was executed, and through it into 'immeasurable space.' But, young though he was when he died, Girtin has incontestably exercised a vastly wider influence than his great fellow worker. In Mr. Roget's words—

'Turner had few, if any, direct followers. His transcendent power was acknowledged by all artists, and the greatest deference was paid to his judgement, when he chose to give it; but the "sincerest flattery of imitation" he never received. Girtin, on the contrary, had hosts of followers even in his lifetime; and it is he who may be looked upon as the real father of the group of painters of which the earlier and leading members of the Water-Colour Society were the foremost representatives. From the time of Girtin's death the school may be considered as dividing itself into two branches, or, more properly, as two separate trees, springing indeed from the same soil, and having grown together as saplings, but with separate roots, one in the practice of Turner, the other in that of Girtin. The former developed into a single giant growth, majestic and solitary, crowning the forest, while in

the latter case a seedling group of rising painters sprang up around a stricken stump and became the school of water-colours that flourished in Britain in the first half of the nineteenth century.' (Vol. i. p. 124.)

It was inevitable that an art which men of such power found capable of indefinite growth and expansion should assert its claims to such consideration as it deserved, and the claim was asserted in the first instance against the Royal Academy, not merely because it excluded from membership all who confined themselves to water-colour work, but because it denied to them the title of painters, and refused to regard their productions as anything more than drawings. This conclusion rested on good grounds, so long as it was aimed at the old school of tinters, who, again, had done good service in their day, and were even yet not without a sphere of usefulness. The practice of throwing washes over surfaces of black and grey had answered its purpose extremely well; nor could anything better be desired for the requirements of the old historical topography. But though the newly developed art stood on a different footing, it could not hope to establish itself without public recognition, and it was useless to look for this recognition through the medium of exhibitions of the Royal Academy. The manner of dealing with water-colour works in these exhibitions was discouraging in the highest degree, and the motives which prompted it were unreasonable. It could now be said with truth that the two forms of art had each its own special advantages, and it followed, therefore, of necessity, that professional rank ought to depend not on the vehicle employed, but on the merit of the pictures produced. The idea of an exhibition which should do for the newly developed art what the Academy sought to do for works in oil, is said to have suggested itself to William Frederick Wells, an able landscape painter, about ten years older than Girtin, and than Turner, to whom he is said also to have suggested the idea of the 'Liber Studiorum.' Wells was joined by Shelley, a figure painter, and their force was strengthened by eight others, among whom the two brothers John and Cornelius Varley were the most conspicuous. These ten, meeting on November 30, 1804, at the Stratford Coffee House in Oxford Street, formed themselves into a body which assumed the title of the Society of Painters in Water Colours.

From this point Mr. Roget's volumes become a history of this Society, to the interests of which he seems to attach himself exclusively. Unhappily, the result of this plan is,

as we have said, that his book is swollen out by a multitude of biographical memoirs, the inclusion of which was not necessarily involved in the original scheme of Mr. Jenkins. With the internal regulation of this Society we are not greatly concerned. Some of the rules were found not to work well, and the circumstances under which the first period of its existence came to an end are to be ascribed probably to the provision by which any money remaining after the payment of yearly expenses was divided among the members in sums proportioned to the value of the pictures sent in and retained for exhibition, the estimate of their value being given by the painter himself. The Society, having secured rooms in Lower Brook Street, started in its work with sixteen artists, most of whom rose to eminence. The experiment seemed to be, and for the time was, singularly successful. Not only had twelve thousand persons paid for admission in the seven weeks during which the exhibition remained open, but, for the first time, visitors showed themselves desirous of becoming purchasers of pictures in water colours. In the pictures themselves the old elements might still be traced. The method of tinting had been retained by Pocock. Gilpin sent some specimens of the topographical drawings which dealt with gentlemen's country seats, while the figure drawing was represented by Shelley, Rigaud, and Cristall, afterwards President of the Society. The landscapes generally showed in greater or lesser degree the patient working from nature, for which the water-colour painters of this country have since been distinguished. But for some time the Society was to find no permanent resting-place. The exhibition of 1807 was held in 118 Pall Mall, the old rooms of the Royal Academy, and these rooms being pronounced dangerous and unfit for public use, another migration took the Society to 16 Old Bond Street. By painters generally, the action of the association was not regarded as altogether satisfactory. Its walls were reserved exclusively for the works of the members and the associates, and thus there seemed to be room for another association open practically to all painters in water colours. On this footing a new body was brought into existence, which, after some changes of name, became known under the title of Associated Artists in Water Colours. Not a few of the members of this body, which had a very short life, afterwards joined the older Society. Among these were De Wint, David Cox, and Cotman. In point of skill and power there was, in fact, little difference between the

two bodies. The strength of both lay in landscape, but the Associated Artists had to contend with difficulties not connected with professional rivalry. The state of the finances compelled them to raise the price of their catalogue, and the exhibition of 1812 was commercially a failure. The contents of the gallery were taken in distraint for rent, and David Cox lost the whole of his drawings for the year.

The older Society became involved in similar perplexities, and was driven to devise means of extrication. The Associated Artists had thrown open their rooms for the reception of oil paintings in addition to those in water colours, and in this the older body resolved to follow their example. The resolution was carried by the casting vote of Cornelius Varley. The act, however, was not final. The resolution was rescinded at a subsequent meeting of eighteen of the members, who ruled that the admission of pictures in oil would entirely change the character of the Society, and be an abandonment of the principle on which they had claimed support. Admitting, therefore, the fact that though they were not less deserving of it, yet this support had in large measure been withdrawn, they could not resist the conclusion that the Society should be dissolved. This conclusion was formally accepted on November 5, their anniversary, and it is only by a stretch of language that the present Society can be said to date its existence from 1804. The body which was called into being at the meeting in John Varley's house a few days before the dissolution of the old Society, declared that the purpose of the nine members then present was to establish an exhibition for pictures in oil and in water colours; and although artists might be invited to contribute, the gallery should, nevertheless, not be thrown open to artists in general. At the same time it was provided that the two classes should be kept separate, and, by some strange confidence in so useless a restriction, that the public should not be allowed to reach the part put aside for oil paintings without passing through the water-colour department. Mr. Roget is fully aware that all this involved a complete breach of continuity, but every effort was made to hide the fact. The advertisement in the catalogue still spoke of 'The Society of Painters in Water 'Colours,' and from the list of pictures it is impossible to learn the medium in which each was painted. Under those conditions the eight years which constituted the second period of the old Society (so far as it can be termed such) passed away, without producing any really satisfactory

results. In 1816 the committee found itself 74*l.* out of pocket, and they came naturally to the conclusion that in dividing the surplus annually amongst the members in proportion to their own estimates of their work they had made a serious mistake. A sum was accordingly funded, and the rule was made that all members should have an equal share in profits, as all had to face the same risks. In 1819 the Society felt itself justified in instituting three premiums of 30*l.* each as an incitement to the production of more important works for the improvement of the Association. These premiums were awarded to Basset, Cristall, and Cornelius Varley; but there is no evidence to show in what medium these works were executed. The exhibition of 1820 showed that measures of a stringent kind were needed to place the Society on a trustworthy basis. To all but two or three members it became clear that the experiment, as Mr. Roget puts it, of pouring oil on the troubled waters, had been tried long enough, and had failed. In June 1820 a large majority of members determined that the Society should for the future confine itself to water colours only, and it was announced that the next exhibition of 'The Society of Painters in Water Colours' would be held in the Roman Gallery of the Egyptian Hall in Piccadilly. In spite of this change of title, it must in strictness of speech be admitted that the change made in 1820 did not amount to a breach of continuity, such as had occurred eight years before. No resolution for the dissolution of the Society had been passed, or even suggested, and all who were members up to this time remained such without re-election. We need not deny their right to revert to the old title, but it was not altogether ingenuous, in putting forth the catalogue of 1821, to speak of the rooms in Spring Gardens as having been 'lately occupied by the Society of 'Painters in Water Colours,' who had now taken the opportunity furnished by their change of abode to revert to the original plan of the Society in 1804.

The catalogue which made this announcement is indeed rendered noteworthy by a general survey of the growth and position of water-colour art. It deals chiefly with the prejudices founded on the feebleness of the old topographical drawings, and with the notion that the power and beauty developed in the new phase of the art must be as evanescent as the material employed in it was frail and perishable. No philosophical reasons, it was urged, ever were or could be adduced against 'the possibility of producing by means

'of water colours pictures equal in beauty and permanency 'of colour, as well as durability, to those executed in oil.' Speaking of the critics who still lament the infatuation which throws away so much time and talent on materials so perishable, the announcement adds that 'such writers must 'have forgotten (if they ever knew) that the cartoons of 'Raphael, executed on paper in water colours, have already 'lasted above 300 years without being much indebted to 'the conservative care of their successive owners.' The war is carried into the enemy's country, when it is asserted that paintings in water colours (whatever imperfection may yet exist in them) 'are not, like those in oil, liable to the change 'in the oil itself, of the lead which enters into so many pig-'ments, of the varnish, the dirt, and smoke which it 'acquires, and, above all, of the destructive practices of 'picture-cleaners, which, however reprehensible, originate 'in the imperfection of the materials of oil pictures. These 'remarks are not intended to disparage oil-painting, the 'Society being well convinced of its advantages; but they 'feel it due to themselves to give their art the benefit of a 'fair comparison.' (Vol. i. p. 428.)

We need not do more than refer to the more recent inquiries on this subject, of which Mr. Roget has given a clear and interesting summary. Scarcely five years ago a cry was raised that water-colour drawings were liable to serious and rapid injury even by ordinary exposure to daylight. The first report of the committee appointed to deal with the question treated only of the physical effect of light on such works, the chemical effect being reserved for a second report, which gave a welcome assurance that, although some colours formerly too much employed may indeed be hopelessly evanescent, there still remains at the command of the painter in water colours 'a full gamut of permanent hues in which 'he may with confidence assume that his work can be 'rendered "beautiful for ever."' Amongst painters in water colours there has been some carelessness in the use of colours, but, as a body, they deserve credit for taking great care. Thus of Samuel Palmer it has been said that he 'took infinite pains in the preparation of his pigments, and 'would use several palettes in order that he might not be 'tempted to mix those colours together which did not pro-'perly assort, or whose juxtaposition might lead to serious 'consequences.' The judgement of Mr. Carl Haag is still more valuable. On first coming to England in 1847 he carefully obtained samples of all pigments supplied by the

colourmen, and submitted them to every kind of test before he attempted to paint any pictures. The result was that he rigidly confined himself, then and since, in his practice to mineral colours, rejecting opaque white from the first, 'not 'as being in itself unpermanent, but because he distrusted 'its combination with other pigments.' He found his white lights in his paper; and when it became necessary to do so, he took them out after the fashion attributed to Girtin or to Turner. Mr. Roget adds that 'he abstained from mixing 'his colours, applying them separately in a pure state in 'successive superincumbent washes, stippling with the point 'of the brush, where needed, afterwards.' There is much to be said in favour of this method, but it would probably not be easy to draw a hard and fast line for its application.

Two exhibitions in Piccadilly having failed to bring the financial improvement which had been looked for, the Society obtained a lease for seven years of a gallery then being erected in Pall Mall East, and the move thus made turned out to be a happy one. The prosperity of its early days was fully restored, and the greatest care was shown in guarding against a recurrence of the difficulties which had caused so much annoyance and loss. Henceforth it was to hold its ground in friendly rivalry with all other bodies existing for the advancement of British art. Those who suffered, or thought that they suffered, from the lines of action prescribed to themselves by those societies, would naturally hold that there was room for improvement in their constitution. The Old Society would admit the works only of its own members and associates. The 'British In-'stitution,' which had still a long course to run, excluded all water-colour works from its exhibitions. The 'Society of 'British Artists,' which held its first exhibition at Suffolk Street in 1824, provided space for paintings in both water and oil colours; and in 1832 the 'New Society of Painters 'in Water Colours' seemed to owe its existence to a certain animosity against the real or supposed exclusiveness of the Old Society with the same title. The New Society is now the Royal Institution of Painters in Water Colours, and deserves, as much as the Old Society, the gratitude of all who care for truth, power, and beauty in English art. In a pre-eminent degree this praise may be claimed for the great body of English landscape painters; and the greatest hope of further advancement lies in the enthusiasm which the painter may feel in his own work, and still more in the work of his brother students. We may take as an instance

the remarks of Uwins on the power and the feeling shown by his friend William Havell.

'Havell is still with me,' he writes to Severn, 'going on gloriously. He is painting a picture of the lovely bay of Baia, which sparkles with all the gems of the East, and is as true as it is beautiful. I really consider myself to be happy in working in the same room with him. To see him paint is like seeing Paganini play the fiddle. . . . He seems to be the only man who enters into the true poetry of the art. Turner depends too much on his gods and goddesses and his classical story, and Callcott is nothing without a low horizon and a Dutch seaport; but Havell gives you the "call of incense-breathing moon," or shows the "glorious orb of day" leaving a world full of loveliness and setting in a blaze of splendour. This is poetry: there is no dressing up, no canting sentiment, no forced endeavour to make nature what nature is not. The girl comes dancing through the vineyard with all the hilarity of innocence, and the vine-dresser goes through his daily work with quiet simplicity. The poets have done all this . . . but amongst the painters Havell seems to me the first that has attempted it.' (Vol. i. p. 451.)

This praise may or may not be exaggerated, but it points to a spirit among English painters generally, the loss of which would be disastrous. It is refreshing to find so many instances of a readiness to impart knowledge when there might seem to be some possible benefit to the possessor in withholding it. When George Barret was asked by students to explain his practice to them, he did so unhesitatingly, declaring that no good painter ought to have 'secrets.' 'Everything,' he said, 'is in the painter's fe elings; without 'feeling all the secrets in the world are use less.' Nor was it Uwins alone who spoke of the truthfulness of Havell's work as the source and cause of its power and beauty. It was not less appreciated by others who affirmed that the richness and depth of colouring in some of his paintings suffered little in comparison with paintings in oils, and that his representation of sunshine was so near the truth that it made the eyes ache to look at it. His own power of reproducing light made him not less enthusiastic in his admiration of Turner, of whom and of Girtin he says emphatically that the knowledge which they had acquired of sunlight was 'so completely developed in their works that it seemed to 'have been held in hand and thrown into the subject at 'pleasure.' The same generosity of appreciation marked the life of J. D. Harding, a man who achieved a vast amount of excellent work in his day, and whose wide influence as a teacher was wholly for good. Harding's intellectual growth was slow. His father complained to Samuel Prout, from

whom his son was receiving some lessons, that he had no ideas. 'Let him draw till they come,' was Prout's answer; but for a time it seemed as though they would not come. Harding was yet to be pre-eminent as an exponent of tree drawing; but his first attempt to sketch trees in Greenwich Park so bewildered him that the notion of making him a painter was all but definitely abandoned. In this time of discouragement, but still longing and hoping to do better, he saw an artist sketching, and went up to him to ask some question. The sketcher shut his book in the face of the lad, who 'shrank away behind the Observatory to hide 'the tears which he could not restrain. There, however, he 'made a solemn vow, that, if it should please God to let him 'become acquainted with the secrets of art, he would 'teach them to everybody.' His vow was amply fulfilled.

Harding, however, is by no means the only English water-colour painter whose greatness has been achieved at the cost of much seemingly useless toil, and in face of the most discouraging difficulties. Prout is even a more signal example of courage in discouragement than is his pupil Harding. From his boyhood onward the effect of a sunstroke seemed likely to place an insurmountable barrier in the way of his success; but he was as persevering as he urged Harding to be. The painter who was to shed a wonderful glory over masses of architectural forms was as bewildered and as unsuccessful in his first attempts at drawing buildings as Harding was in his delineation of leaves and branches. Taken to St. German's by the antiquary, John Britton, to sketch the church there, Prout became utterly bewildered in the effort to set down the outlines of the west front; and the result was, in Britton's words, 'a drawing so inaccurate 'in proportion and details that it was unfit for engraving.' He failed not less signally at Truro, and Britton was compelled to cancel their agreement. 'The parting,' he says, 'was on perfectly good terms, though exceedingly mortify-'ing to both parties, for his skill as an artist had been 'impeached, and I had to pay a few pounds for a speculation 'which completely failed.' But lack of skill and lack of bodily strength were resisted manfully; and when, in 1819, his ill-health drove him across the Channel, he found in Normandy a spell which acted on him with magic power. The fetters seemed to fall from his hands, and he woke to his full mental power, though his body remained feeble to the end. The city of Rouen, in which he found himself,

appealed to feelings of which, perhaps, he had been scarcely conscious, but which were henceforth to act as a master passion. Constant excursions made from this time to France, the Netherlands, Germany, and Italy, soon supplied him with a vast wealth of forms and ideas. His drawings were lit up with marvellous brilliancy. Some critics, indeed, took strong exception to his colouring, on the ground that he used brown for his shadows, 'preserving the chiaro-oscuro, 'indeed, but obtaining warmth where it ought not to exist.' Nevertheless, Prout was in substance right, as Turner was right, when he made certain objects under certain conditions send out shadows in vermilion. Mr. Roget, we have said, has introduced into his volumes a large amount of unnecessary and uninteresting matter, but little exception can be taken to the manner in which he has dealt with the lives and the work of some of the men who were great as thinkers in the wide domain of their art. Prout had wonderful powers, and the faults which we may mark in his pictures may probably be traced in great part to the fact that his health did not allow him to paint in the open air. Many of his drawings have become greatly faded, and hence the remarks made on his colouring by contemporary critics have a special value. According to Mr. Jenkins, Prout had a regular mechanical system in preparing his drawings, laying them in in sepia, or brown and grey, the lines being gone over with a pen, in which a warm brown colour was used. But whatever might be the defects of his method, Mr. Ruskin maintains that 'the truest and happiest 'association of hues in sun and shade to be found in modern 'water-colour art (excepting only Hunt and De Wint) will 'be found in portions of Prout's more important works.' Delighting in multitudes of figures and in every object belonging to the life of great cities, Prout imparts to his crowds a character which brings them into harmony with the architectural forms of his subject. His figures are full of life, but their movements are not hurried. All are, as Mr. Ruskin says of them, as quiet as the cathedral of Chartres; and Mr. Roget may well add that 'the feeling 'of repose is enhanced and the union strengthened by a 'broad distribution of light and shade, which favours a 'general comprehension of the scene and prevents the eye 'from dwelling needlessly on separate elements.' To draw marked distinctions of superiority or inferiority between his drawings in France and Belgium, Germany or Italy, is impossible. His own enthusiasm never flagged, and this is

the result of the charm which gives unfailing delight to those who see his work.

Worthy to be put in comparison with Prout is Cotman, a painter whose name we have already had occasion to mention, and whose art is more many-sided and not less truthful than that of Prout. A vast number of his drawings were engraved for volumes illustrating the architectural antiquities of Norfolk and other English counties. In 1817 he went to Normandy, to do for that country the same work which he had already done for so many parts of England. Of these plates some, Mr. Roget remarks, 'are purely architectural; 'in others the subjects are treated pictorially; a few, such as 'the "Château Gaillard" and the "Castle of Tankerville," 'being more in the nature of general landscape.' The same scenes were thus giving inspiration at much the same time to Edridge, Cotman, and Prout. In 1825 an assurance was conveyed to Cotman that, if he would allow it, the Society of Painters in Water Colours would be 'proud to 'admit him' to their fellowship without requiring him to send any specimens of his work for their approval. But, in spite of such appreciation, he was still an unsuccessful man in his profession, of which he emphatically spoke as a miserable one. His pictures did not sell, and in 1834 he was glad to accept the office of drawing-master at King's College, London. He had suffered long from nervous depression, but there is nothing to show that he was at any time, as the phrase goes, out of his mind. He had done great and admirable work, and his powers as a painter were manifestly growing to the last. Had his paintings received during his lifetime anything at all approaching to the appreciation which they have won for his name since his death, no doubt the course of his latter years would have been very different. Some of his latest chalk sketches, now in the possession of Mr. Reeve, of Norwich, point to probable future changes in the character of his work, and, in Mr. Roget's words, 'foreshadow a style resembling in its im-'petuous power that of the later time of David Cox.'

Like that of Prout and Harding, the childhood of David Cox was not one of very early or special promise, nor were the conditions of his life likely to foster in him a love of art in its higher forms. The engraver Pye has left a note, in which he says, 'When I first knew David Cox he was 'employed to wield the great hammer at a blacksmith's shop 'in Windmill Yard, Digbeth, Birmingham.' Happily the lad's physical strength unfitted him for such work, and the

enforced leisure which followed the accident of a broken leg gave him an opportunity of showing his power of drawing by copying prints. Taking then to colours, he managed to get a price for some of these first attempts; and, happily again, his father did not think it necessary to repress a taste which many fathers have resolutely discouraged. His first employment, which was in the toy trade, required him to paint in miniature upon lockets or snuff-boxes; but in no long time he was engaged in a theatre, where, like many other painters who have risen to the highest eminence, he became scene-painter. From the Birmingham theatre David Cox found his way to London, where he succeeded in gaining for his sketches the sum of two guineas for each dozen, the sum which had been given to young Cotman for his drawings ten years before. For some years his life was not an easy one; but, in 1809, the committee of the Associated Artists received his drawings for exhibition with the frank declaration that they displayed 'high originality.' Some of his critics objected, indeed, that his skies seemed to be composed of the same materials with his landscape, so that it was 'hard to know where the one ended and the other 'began.' The supposed fault of the drawings may well have been their great merit. In the following year he became President of the Association; and, four years later, the collapse of the Society brought on him the loss of his drawings, which we have already mentioned. To a large extent his time was taken up in teaching and in the preparation of practical works containing prints to serve as 'copy' for pupils, the first of these being a 'Treatise on 'Landscape Painting and Effect in Water Colours.' His election, in 1812, as an associate of the Water-Colour Society in its secondary stage, in which it admitted paintings both in water colour and in oil, assured his professional position. During the presidency of Cristall he contributed, on an average, nearly thirty drawings yearly. His reputation rose steadily. In 1823 he attracted great attention by his brilliant picture of 'The Embarkation of George IV. 'at Greenwich'; but through his fancy subjects of Carthage, pirates, and brigands, he was working his way to the later character with which his name is now especially associated. Of these fancy pictures his biographer, Mr. Solly, speaks as displaying much delicate finish, but also much stiff and constrained drawing of foliage, the high lights on the trees being touched in with body colour. This method he afterwards abandoned, and towards the close of his life he spoke

of his rejection of it with an emphasis which seemed to imply something like settled disapproval. His work, indeed, was always eminently straightforward; but he knew how to avail himself of unusual materials which he chanced to find well fitted for his purpose. Thus, in 1836, he happened to meet with some rough Scotch wrapping-paper, which turned out to be very unabsorbent of colour, being made from old linen sailcloth well bleached. The ream which he ordered weighed, to his surprise, 280 lbs. A friend shared in the purchase; but in after years Cox regretted that he had not ordered more, as he never succeeded in getting the same quality again. On this paper he painted some of his most powerful studies and pictures.

'It gave,' his biographer tells us, 'the texture he required, and suited to his peculiar mode of rapid work with a large brush, charged as full as possible with very wet though rich colour. It enabled him to obtain *power* at once. The paper was very thick, not quite white, with here and there little black or brown specks. In the landscape parts these specks were of no consequence, but they looked out of place in the sky. On one occasion, being asked what he did to get rid of them, he replied: "Oh! I just put wings to them, and then they fly away as birds."' (Vol. ii. p. 158.)

Thus far, although he had only once crossed the English Channel, his yearly excursions had carried him over most parts of England; but a sojourn at Bettws-y-Coed, in 1844, determined his movements for ten successive years. He had thought of purchasing a house there, but this plan was never carried out. During those years he was painting more and more in oils, for which he had long shown a strong inclination. In the end he declared his preference for the viscid or opaque vehicle. The subjects of these pictures, however, were almost always what he had before painted in water colours, and he continued to exhibit in the Water-Colour Society's rooms pictures as carefully wrought and as magnificent as any he had ever sent thither. In 1847 he exhibited his splendid picture of Bolton Abbey, of which Cox himself said, 'This, the members all seem to agree, is 'the very best drawing I have ever made, and they have 'used the most expressive words of praise I have ever 'received.' In 1848 his great contribution was the 'Sky-'lark'—'an open rural scene of light and air and sweet 'repose'—in which a group of children are looking up at the soaring songster. The picture was sold in Mr. Levy's collection, in 1876, for 1,365*l.* He repeated the same subject in oils in 1849. In the next year he sent 'Beeston Castle,

'Cheshire,' which is, indeed, one of his most splendid works. In 1850 he produced a picture which made on many who saw it in the exhibition of that year an impression which has never been weakened. The touching solemnity and beauty of the 'Welsh Funeral at Bettws-y-Coed' is, to adopt the words of Mr. Jenkins, 'produced by mere suggestion. The 'church is seen in small part only, and not a face is visible, 'the backs of the mourners being towards the spectator, as 'the slow procession passes down a road into the yew-tree 'shade of the graveyard.' The painter, clearly and rightly impressed with his own work, repeated the subject two or three times in oils; but, strange to say, this very fine work was not sold in the gallery. Cox's brother-painter, Topham, persuaded an Art Union prizeholder to buy it for 50*l.*; but the purchaser found it so little to his liking that he induced Topham to purchase it back at the same price.' On this fact Mr. Roget judiciously remarks that, though to the observant lover of art this and other like pictures evince the hand of a master, and are

'far more suggestive of the real scene or effect than the most laboured imitation of the minute and accurate copyist of nature's details, they appeared to most people "slight and careless," and were pronounced "mere blots of colour." Cox himself knew their value, and would wince a little at the criticisms passed upon them. . . . Three years later, when his handling had become yet looser and the details less defined, though his feeling for nature in her solemn moods was deeper than ever, he writes in a tone of quite unusual complaint as follows respecting the exhibition of 1853: "I wish now I had taken Mr. Roberts's advice and sent my drawings in without a price, as it strikes me the committee think them too rough; they forget that they are the *work of the mind*, which I consider very far before the portraits of places (views)."'

On this important subject we have already spoken so much in detail* that we need add nothing more here; but we may cite (and we do so with full assent) the opinions of some who have the best title to pronounce judgement. There is no doubt that Cox's later pictures possess, as his biographer asserts, 'a pathos and a power to touch the heart, and 'waken the higher sympathies of men, which to kindred 'minds is altogether irresistible.' It is only fair that he should be placed in comparison with Turner, and he will not fail in the ordeal. It has been well said that in his mastery over air and space he seems often to excel Turner, whose

* Edinburgh Review, January, 1880. Life of J. M. W. Turner.

'cloud-marking often tends to give the sky undue solidity, rivalling and sometimes surpassing that of the earth and what stands upon it. In delicacy of manipulation, in variety of invention, in range of experiences, and in sweep of knowledge, Turner is no doubt his superior; but not in the loyalty of his service to nature, nor in his intense power of realising her aspects, with a rapidity and simplicity of means that astonish, but in which lies the certainty of thorough understanding and the finest imaginative power.' (Vol. ii. p. 166.)

Few things are more remarkable in the history of art than the vast and rapid increase in the commercial value of his works since his death—the 'Hayfield,' to take a single instance, for which he received 50*l.*, being sold in the sale of Mr. Quilter's collection in 1875 for 2,950*l.*

David Cox, it must frankly be admitted, was a greater man than Copley Fielding, of whom Mr. Roget speaks with admirable impartiality, as well as with thorough appreciation. In the long series of years during which Fielding was first member, then President, of the Society of Painters in Water Colours, he promoted with indefatigable energy the interests of the association to which he belonged. As a teacher, he did much to raise the taste and feeling of the general public for the faithful rendering of nature. But, though less of a thinker than David Cox, perhaps because he was so, he was in his lifetime decidedly more popular. Speaking generally, we may say that no strain was needed to understand his meaning. His forms spoke for themselves. A large number of his works, even when taken from the mountain scenery of Great Britain, appealed to the common eye for the picturesque, while the exquisite finish of his workmanship completed the charm. But after allowing full weight to his faults, whatever they may have been, there are in him a depth of feeling and a love of truth which rise above the conventionalisms from which in his day he had to emancipate himself; nor can it be denied that he freed himself effectually. Although his rendering of what he saw lay within a narrower range than that of David Cox and some other painters of his own Society, there are few of his works which have not some marks of truth which he had made peculiarly his own. Like Turner, he could drive the eye of the spectator into the distance by a skilful treatment of his foregrounds. These foregrounds, as Mr. Ruskin puts it, suggested everything while they represented nothing, and so compelled the spectator to go forward. 'There, where 'the sun broke wide upon the moor, he must walk and 'wander: he could not stumble and hesitate over the near

'rocks, nor stop to botanise on the first inches of his path.' But with those who take the most genuine delight in his work the thought of Fielding is probably associated chiefly with his representations of moorland and moorland air and mist. In these Mr. Ruskin declares that 'he produced some 'of the most perfect and faultless passages of mist and rain-'cloud which art has ever seen. . . . Had he painted five 'instead of five hundred such, and gone on to other sources 'of beauty, he might, there can be little doubt, have been 'one of the greatest artists.'

But of him and of many more whom we must not even name, the Society to which they devoted themselves may deservedly be proud. These, again, form but a small portion of the illustrious band who have undertaken and performed the task of developing and raising water-colour art, but who lie beyond the range of the self-imposed plan of Mr. Roget. The record of the one is really, in all that concerns the truthfulness of their work, a record of the other. Here they all stand on common ground; and, as lovers of truth, we can acknowledge our debt of gratitude for all that has been already achieved. It is indeed a wonderful history, when we remember that it is practically comprised in the space of a single century. In that short time the curious topographical drawing which formed the primary school of English water-colour art seems to have receded into an immeasurable distance; and the mechanical conventionalism to which Girtin gave the death-blow has almost vanished from our memories. We could have wished to have Mr. Roget's history of this wonderful creation in another form; but virtually he has given us a fair and unprejudiced survey of the great school of English water-colour painters.

ART. IV.—*The Writings of James Russell Lowell.* In ten volumes, 12mo. Riverside Edition. Republished in London, 1890.

THE following pages were written when we had no foreboding that Mr. Lowell, although known to be in bad health, was near his end. Possibly they are the more impartial and dispassionate, for in the sense of a recent loss there is a temptation to tone down even friendly criticism, and to exaggerate eulogies that are thoroughly deserved. If those who are gone from us are still sensible to the grateful appreciation of their fellow-mortals, it is given to Lowell to know that he had not lived in vain. Never do we remember more unanimity in innumerable obituary notices; nor has the requiem that has been raised in memory of the departed been broken by a single discordant note. Mr. Lowell was one of the men of sensitive refinement and broad culture to whom the busy American Republic owes a great debt of gratitude. They have kept their countrymen in touch with the intellectual life and sympathies of the Old World, and Europe in turn has been largely indebted to them. American energy and ability, for the most part, have found their outlets in trade, commerce, or finance, and above all in the turmoil of party politics. There has never been any lack of patriots, statesmen, and generals, from Washington and Jefferson to Lincoln and Grant. But while politics offered a tempting career to ambition, and, in the intervals that could be spared from business, engrossed the interest of the nation, literature was at a discount. Responding to the toast of literature at the celebration of the anniversary of Washington's inauguration, Lowell himself admitted it and apologised. The reading class, he said, was small in a busy people, and the ephemeral news-sheet satisfied most of them. Books were chiefly pirated and imported. They were the one article which the self-contained Republic did not care to protect with heavy duties, and did not pride itself upon producing. 'We had no 'capital towards which all the streams of moral and in-'tellectual energy might converge to fill a reservoir on 'which all could draw.' Consequently, 'there are many 'careers open to ambition, all of them more tempting and 'more gainful than the making of books. Our people are 'of necessity largely intent on national ends, and our acces-'sions from Europe tended to increase this predisposition.'

Nevertheless—and Lowell stood before his audience as a living example—there had always been Americans whose literary vitality was not to be suppressed. Like him, they claimed their share—and a large share—in the literary kinship of the English race. Like him, in their literary Odysseys among the authors and the countries of Europe, they imbued themselves with cosmopolitan tastes. Their precursor may be said to have been Washington Irving, whose affections were touched by the scenery, the manners, the halls and the homesteads of old England, and whose fancy was fired by the chivalry and superstition of old Spain, and the wars when the waning Crescent was waging its death-struggle with the Cross. Irving, with his graceful historical romances, was followed by poets and brilliant masters of fiction and more serious historical students. There were Bancroft, and Longfellow, and Nathaniel Hawthorne, Prescott and Parkman, Ticknor and Motley, and sundry others. They all gave evidence of their irrepressible gifts by striking into an exceptional and unpopular career. With scarcely an exception, in their own world of the intellect they all showed the innate American versatility. They wrote books and delivered addresses; often they were more or less of Mezzofantis in their mastery of foreign languages; they assimilated themselves to European habits of thought, and followed bypaths of antiquated lore and language, unfamiliar even to highly educated natives. They idealised and localised the pagan mythology with the realism of a modern Roman Zola; they revived the golden legends and the chivalrous traditions of the Round Table, reclothing them in attractive modern dress; and with indefatigable patience they ransacked the musty records of Simancas and Venice and many a continental capital, translating the contents of their notebooks into vivid and dramatic history. We say that Europe owes them a great debt of gratitude, because they brought fresh minds and fancies to their patient labours of love. They wrote and analysed and criticised with unprejudiced judgements, from somewhat original standpoints; and in many respects, as citizens of a flourishing democracy, their social and political opinions were far in advance of the times. They travelled through classical and mediæval Europe with something of the pious sentiment that inspires the Christian pilgrim in Palestine, and they carried almost to excess their adoration of the immortals, from Homer and Æschylus to Dante and Shakespeare. To do America bare justice, it appreciated their genius and

attainments, if it was chary of buying their books. They went home to fill chairs of history and *belles-lettres*, and the lectures they delivered and the enthusiasm they communicated have been of inappreciable benefit to the younger generations of their countrymen. Sometimes, with an honourable disregard for professional training, they have been chosen for high diplomatic posts, and they have justified the choice by discharging their political duties with tact and dignity.

Mr. Lowell was one of the most brilliant and versatile of that illustrious company, and perhaps no one of them has done more various or more useful work. It is true he had made no solid contribution to history, such as the 'Conquest 'of Mexico,' the 'Revolt of the Netherlands,' or the 'Rise 'and Progress of the United States.' But, on the other hand, in the course of a long life of leisurely exertion, he had taken all *belles-lettres* for his province. With delicate powers of appreciation and discrimination, with a sensitive instinct for comparative analysis, he was blessed with a singularly retentive memory. Abounding in rich illustration and apposite quotation, he evidently had seldom to hunt up a reference. Consequently his thoughts found lucid expression in a bright and flowing style, and the great attraction of his innumerable articles on miscellaneous subjects is that they are essentially and eminently readable. The proof is that, if you turn to some passage for a special purpose, it is difficult to lay the volume down. Now he is grave; now he is humorously familiar; now he is quoting Homer or one of the Fathers or Schoolmen, or he is pointing a moral or enforcing a truth by some quaint Transatlantic drollery in the manner of Sam Slick. Except occasionally in the character of a ruthlessly conscientious critic, he never parades his recondite learning or the wide range of his reading, and it is only gradually we learn to realise the wealth of treasure he had amassed. For example, he shows a rare acquaintance with recondite philology, and incidentally in his short continental wanderings he made himself one of the first living authorities on old French and Provençal poetry.

The charm that lures you on when you drop casually into one of his literary essays is partly in the new and unexpected lights which are continually flashing before you, and partly in the humour and the pointed satire which are essential parts of himself. Whether he goes moose-shooting as a youth in the backwoods of Maine, or follows Dante into

the Inferno with bated breath, he has always an eye for the comical and grotesque. Like Johnson, when on a memorable occasion that philosopher fell foul of the obsequious Boswell, Lowell could overwhelm a literary victim with a torrent of insulting and degrading metaphors. For the most part his satire is light and frolicsome; but when it was inspired by profound conviction or the fervour of righteous indignation, it became a really terrible weapon. If he leaves no monumental work of history, he could boast of having revolutionised the educated sentiment of a nation by a series of fugitive poems. The 'Biglow Papers' are unique. Cervantes, whom Lowell so heartily admired, shot his sharpest arrows in the air; for Spanish knight-errantry had been laughed away long before, and, as Lowell points out, the character of Don Quixote is simply a masterpiece of eccentric humour conveying no special moral. But when Lowell, who began as a sympathiser with slavery, changed suddenly to an abolitionist, he shifted the lines of political division; he converted many bigoted Northern democrats to a course of action in conflict with their old party relations and apparent interests; and, above all, he revolutionised the tone of fashionable Northern society. The feat was the more remarkable that he deliberately handicapped himself. The poet and prophet of the new political revelation was Hosea Biglow, clad in coarse homespun, and talking the vulgar dialect of New England pedlars and peasants. And the sponsor of Mr. Biglow was a pragmatical parson, whose prosy disquisitions on parochial subjects were in reality a triumph of shrewdness and wit. But thenceforth it became creditable to advocate abolition in drawing-rooms, and to preach it from fashionable city pulpits to congregations paying fancy prices for their pews. In the workshops, the bar-rooms, and other popular resorts, the laugh was turned against the slaveowners; the ground was prepared for the popular enthusiasm which recruited the armies that exhausted the South, and Lowell must share with Lincoln and Grant the glory of the crowning victories. The poems came out originally in the 'Boston Courier,' and doubtless the satirist was encouraged to go forward as he was fired and astonished by his startling success. His conscience was quickened by recognising the responsibilities he had half-unconsciously assumed. When he had dropped the mask of the anonymous, it needed no ordinary effort or courage in a man of his retiring literary temperament to deliver a rude attack on vested interests, to assail social susceptibilities,

and consequently to make bitter enemies on all sides. For his sneers at the Southern pedigrees and aristocratic pretensions were far more irritating than his satirical onslaughts on that institution of slavery which merely involved land values and cotton quotations.

We see another, and yet a not dissimilar, side to his character in his serious poems. Like some of his more illustrious American contemporaries who have taken higher poetical rank, he ennobles duty, exalts morality, and will listen to no compromise with truth. If a man has a talent of any kind, it is Lowell's creed that he is bound to use it, or pay the penalty of neglect or abuse in late and unavailing repentance. Perhaps the most powerful serious poem he ever wrote is the 'Extreme Unction,' that terrible picture of a remorseful deathbed, when the dying man in his hopeless agony is haunted by the spectres of his hopeful youth and his fond early ideals. Hence, conscientiousness, thoroughness, and dispassionate independence are the characteristics of all his literary work. We may not agree with his judgements, but he invariably gives fair reason for them and suggests ample matter for thought.

Nor is the least interesting feature in them the personal revelations, for there is a striking individualism in all his writings. The first of his literary essays in this collection is the 'Moosehead Journal,' a reminiscence of earlier exploration and of roughing it, which was not published till 1853. Though it may be presumed that it was dashed off, as it professes to be, in brief intervals snatched from a short night's rest after a long day's labour, it is full of characteristic thoughts, very characteristically expressed. Even when the thought is noways original, the expression, as the journalist presents it, is neat, novel, and humorous. Thus, he is moralising on the extreme lengths to which his prosaic and eminently practical countrymen carry their devotion to the dollar.

'Were I rich, I should like to found a few lazyships in my Alma Mater by way of counterpoise. The Anglo-Saxon race has accepted the primal curse as a blessing, has deified work, and would not have thanked Adam for abstaining from the apple. They would have dammed the fair rivers of Paradise, substituted cotton for fig-leaves among the Antediluvian populations, and commended man's first disobedience as a wise measure of political economy.'

And there are delightful sketches of the local eccentrics, or 'cranks' in a primitive community, which make us fancy he might have surpassed 'Mark Twain' or Bret Harte, had it

pleased him to devote himself to humorous fiction. For Lowell could hardly have been tediously diffuse, and his quick perceptions of the literary proprieties have generally saved him from riding a drollery to death. The rough sketch of Uncle Zeb is as good in its way as the 'Jumping 'Frog,' or the story of the blue jays. Uncle Zeb is 'always 'ready to contribute (somewhat muddily) to all general con-'versation; but his chief topics were his boots and the '*'*Roostick war.' Half the joke is lost to Englishmen, who must own to a shameful ignorance of that memorable campaign. Nevertheless, they can appreciate old Zeb, who is always ringing the changes on the two subjects of his boots and the beans consumed in the bivouacs; and introducing them *à tort et à travers*, apropos to *bottes* and apropos to nothing. 'If the talk seemed to be flagging, our Uncle 'would put the heel of one boot upon the toe of the other 'to bring it within point-blank range, and say, "Wahl, '"I stump the devil himself to make that 'ere boot hurt '"*my* foot . . ."; or, looking up suddenly, he would 'exclaim, "Wahl, we eat *some* beans to the 'Roostick war, '"I tell *you*!"' There is next to nothing in it all; but the art of making much out of little, with a creative faculty vivified by a sense of the ludicrous, is the secret of the most sparkling American humour. As good as Zeb—though in a very different style—is the grave, self-contained hunter and lumberer, with his quick decision and the sleepless vigilance of his restless eye, who had passed a life in guiding rafts through dangerous rapids, and whose pulses seemed to throb in unison with each oscillation of the birch canoe.

But while the humourist is drawing out Uncle Zeb, and the moralist is meditating on the lonely existence of the lumberer, the poet is communing with the beauties of the wilderness as the canoe glides rapidly down the stream. He indicates rather than describes; but nothing escapes his eye, and so we can understand how all the romance in his imagination is excited, when he crosses the Atlantic, without touching in foggy England, and sets foot for the first time on the shores of sunny Italy. He had the energy of an American, and he had never expended it; anticipation had been raised to the highest point, and he made the leisurely voyage in an old-fashioned sailing ship. So long as he was exhilarated by swift progress, he revelled in the poetry of sky and sea, delighted in the glories of dazzling cloud effects, and found graceful metaphors in the floating marvels of the tiny Portuguese 'men-of-war,' in their purple and

gold, as any beautiful galley of Cleopatra. But a twelve days' calm in mid-Atlantic in mid-August was an experience with which he had never reckoned. The ever-changing sea, with the cessation of movement, had lost all its charm. He declares there is nothing so desperately monotonous; and he no longer wonders at the ferocity of pirates. Nor is there any resource to be found in intellectual distractions, just when life seems to give most leisure for them. 'The dampness 'seems to strike into the wits as into lucifer matches, so 'that one may scratch a thought half a dozen times, and get 'nothing but a faint sputter, the forlorn hope of fire, which 'only goes far enough to leave a sense of suffocation behind 'it.' Next day the wind may rise and the mood will change, and then in the reaction we have a burst of rapture, and a scene which the poet has marked in his memory for future use. 'A cloudless sunrise in mid-ocean is beyond com-'parison for simple grandeur. It is like Dante's style, bare 'and perfect. Naked sun meets naked sea, the true classic 'of Nature.' Lowell's description, bare and brief, unconsciously imitates Dante's style. The poetical rapture is there, but it is severely compressed. And when he subsequently amplifies it in a score or two of sonorous couplets, it must be confessed that the description is lamentably enfeebled in the expansion. For himself, setting out upon his travels, he regrets having been born so late. The age of adventure has gone by with the dreams of El Dorado. The world has been mapped out, surveyed, and measured; science has been abroad, investigating and testing; nothing is nowadays left to the imagination. Blessed were the old voyagers, from Ulysses and Æneas to Marco Polo and Munchausen, who were always coming upon marvels, and who set no limits to their credulity!

'The journals of the elder navigators are prose Odysseys. The geographies of our ancestors were works of fancy and imagination. They read poems where we yawn over items. Their world was a huge wonder-horn, exhaustless as that which Thor strove to drain. Ours could scarce quench the small thirst of a bee. No modern voyager brings back the magical foundation stones of a "Tempest." No Marco Polo, traversing the deserts beyond the city of Lok, could tell of things able to inspire the mind of Milton with

> "Calling shapes and beckoning shadows dire,
> And airy tongues that syllable men's names
> On sands and shores and desert wildernesses."

'It was easy enough to believe the story of Dante when two-thirds of even the upper world were yet untraversed and unmapped. With

every step of the recent traveller an inheritance of the wonderful is diminished. Those beautifully pictured notes of the Possible are redeemed at a ruinous discount in the hard and cumbrous coin of the Actual. How are we not defrauded and impoverished! Does California vie with El Dorado? or are Bruce's Abyssinian kings a set-off for Prester John? . . . How do we not gain a loss in every addition to his Catalogue of Vulgar Errors? Where are the fishes which nidificated in trees? Where the monopodes, sheltering themselves from the sun beneath their single umbrella-like foot—umbrella-like in everything but the fatal necessity of being borrowed?'

So he runs on for another page or so; for when he is in the full flow of quaint illustration his imagination is so fertile that it scarcely knows when to leave off. But, after all, no one knew better that there are pleasures for inquisitive knowledge which are denied to credulous ignorance, and that the earth to the man of education grows more interesting as the ages go on. Associations accumulate, and to the intelligent and romantic American traveller an introduction to classical Italy was a new revelation. In all his writings there is the continual lament that the beloved land of his birth is barren of venerable association. In all of them he is perpetually claiming his birthright as heir to the intellectual triumphs transmitted through an English ancestry. The claim may be valid, but he confesses that the right is beyond the reach of the descendants of the colonists in one essential point:—

'We are *not* Englishmen inasmuch as we only possess their history through our minds, and not by lifelong association with a spot and an idea we call England. History, without the soil it grew in, is more instructive than inspiring. It is laid away in our memories, and does not run in our veins. Surely in all that concerns æsthetics Europeans have us at an immense advantage. They start at a point which we arrive at after weary years, for literature is not shut up in books nor art in galleries; both are taken in by unconscious absorption through the finer pores of mind and character in the atmosphere of society.'

He fancifully dwells on the universal attractions of Italy for the pilgrims and *dilettanti* from all nations. The philosophical and sausage-loving German, the sceptical Frenchman, the English milor of the old school of travel, with the overflowing money-bags he leaves to the manipulation of a courier, alike find their special sources of pleasure—

'But to the American of an imaginative temper, Italy has a deeper charm. She gives him cheaply what gold cannot buy for him at home—a Past at once legendary and authentic, and in which he has an equal claim with every other foreigner. . . . for Rome is the mother

country of every boy who has devoured Plutarch or taken his daily doses of Florus. Italy gives us antiquity, with good roads, cheap living, and, above all, a sense of freedom from responsibility. For him who has escaped thither there is no longer any tyranny of public opinion; its fetters drop from his limbs when he touches that consecrated shore, and he rejoices in the recovery of his own individuality.'

In passages like these there is much in common between Lowell and Heine with his satirical vein of humour. The romance in Lowell's lively imagination loves to put itself playfully at variance with his common sense and advanced political opinions. Of course, in his heart and conscience, he would have approved the unification of liberated Italy, for the article from which we are quoting must have been published nearly forty years ago. But as the æsthetic *dilettante*, and in the way of exhilarating novelty, we can see him revelling in the picturesque abuses of the old system, when urban sanitation had greatly retrograded since the times of the Cæsars, and when the country, cut up into half a score of states, was groaning under Austrian and papal misrule. He enjoys, and almost admires, the ill-regulated impulses of a people of emotional temperament, who are more like children than men. A violent squabble at a *dogana*, on the question whether a dead parrot is liable to duty, invites him to paradoxical moralising on the contrasts between his countrymen and the Italians, and not altogether to the advantage of the former. He asks himself, although not in so many words, whether it is not possible to be too earnest and practical. May not abounding commercial prosperity mean partial mental paralysis, and the general deadening of those sentiments and pleasurable emotions which give piquancy and relief to the drudgery of existence? May not unexampled material success be a symptom of national decay? For a nation cannot live by intellect alone, and 'it would be easier to make a people great in whom the 'animal is vigorous, than to keep one so after it has begun 'to spindle into over-intellectuality.'

But, like Heine, the essayist knows too well to bore us into dwelling at tedious length on paradoxical theories, which no one would be more ready to dispute than himself. He is riding among the Alban Hills, and probably he beguiled the way with such quaint fancies while his mule was plodding along in the coppices of an extinct crater. Versatile and volatile, as one of the frisky squirrels of his native New England, he is chattering the next moment on the picturesque beauties of the scenery, and enraptured by

the wide range of views over the rolling expanse of the Campagna. He paints the melting colours of cloudland and mountain with the pen of a poet and the pencil of an artist. And, looking back upon the grey old towns that clung to the sides and summits of seemingly inaccessible peaks, he remarks, characteristically, that we moderns are greatly indebted to the ruthless Saracens, and to the quarrels of the robber barons of the Middle Ages. It was to be out of their way that the people made their homes in spots so sublime, but so unsuited for habitation. They abandoned the rich plains to desolation and malaria, and scratched the bare rock for a painful subsistence, where otherwise only an American land company could have induced settlers to locate themselves.

'I have seen an insect that makes a mask for himself out of the lichens of the rock over which he crawls, contriving so to deceive the birds; and the towns in this wild region would seem to have been built on the same principle. Made of the same stone with the cliffs on which they perch, it asks good eyesight to make them out at the distance of a few miles, and every wandering mountain mist annihilates them for the moment.'

We naturally turn to the articles in the 'Library of Old 'Authors,' written between 1858 and 1864, for some insight into his intellectual friendships and the favourite companions of his solitude. He has the bump of veneration largely developed: there are idols he has enshrined in his innermost affections, and he is loth that any one but himself should take liberties with them. For himself, though he reserves free right of judgement, he always approaches them with grateful reverence. To err is human; the best writers had their faults, and could not in the nature of things be invariably equal to themselves; but the godlike genius of a Dante or a Shakespeare should be interpreted and commented on rather than criticised. Consequently, the profanity of unsympathetic editors and commentators volunteering for tasks for which they are glaringly incompetent provokes him to resentful outbreaks of spleen. In those articles where he took modern editions and collections for his texts, we have a taste of the bitterest quality of the satirist of the 'Biglow Papers.' Pleasantly enough he draws his distinctions between the student, with whom he sympathises, and the mere collector or the bibliomaniac. But when he falls foul of any one whom he believes to be a presumptuous and incapable critic, he lays on the cat o' nine tails with unsparing severity. He gloats over the sufferings

of the writhing victim. He seems to have owed Halliwell a grudge for having taken Shakespeare's memory in charge, as if Halliwell had provoked the curse engraved on the poet's tomb. Incidentally, in an article on Shakespeare, he remarks that the poet had been singularly unfortunate in all his editors. And he is especially and almost venomously hard on Mr. Halliwell's editing of the works of Marston. He declares, for example, that Halliwell must have taken the careless dramatist at his word, in still 'leaving all emendation to the reader;' and if he charitably consents to look over some of his shortcomings, it is on the supposition that the proof sheets had never been revised. In short, Mr. Lowell, like most earnest scholars, is a good literary hater; nor does Hazlitt, in the editorial capacity, fare much better at his hands. With his catholic tastes he is a safe and useful guide to the real merits of certain half-forgotten authors, whom it has become a fashion to reprint and to pretend to admire. There have been dramatists whose dulness seems to have been redeemed by the indecency to which they owed their popularity with an immoral society; and poets, like authors, who have had the luck to be crowned with laurel on the strength of a single happy hit. His satirical remarks on Southwell's paraphrasing of the Psalms are singularly happy: he argues characteristically, though not in so many words, that because a man was a martyr, that does not entitle him to be canonised as a poet, and he rises into eloquence when resentfully contrasting the verse-mongering Jesuit with the fervid inspiration of the saintly Herbert. The diluting of David may be an innocent enough occupation;

'but to regard these metrical mechanics as sacred because nobody wishes to touch them, as meritorious because no one can be merry in their company—to rank them in the same class with those ancient songs of the Church, sweet with the breath of the saints, sparkling with the tears of pilgrim penitents, and warm with the fervour of martyrs—nay, to set them up beside such poems as those of Herbert, composed in the upper chambers of the soul that open towards the sun's rising, is to confound piety with dulness and the manna of heaven with its sickening namesake from the apothecary's drawer.'

On the other hand, analysing the difficulty of translation, of truly rendering the spirit of the original in something like the same measure and numbers, he does enthusiastic justice to the Homer of Chapman, and there we heartily agree. Short of finding another Homer to translate Homer, it would have been hard to do better, and some of the passages in

Chapman are simply sublime. The translation, as Mr. Lowell says of it, has the crowning merit of being, where it is most successful, thoroughly alive. Were we not familiar with 'Christopher North's' admirable articles on Homer, we should say it would be difficult to pay the quaint old Englishman a more discriminating tribute than Lowell has done.

'Chapman's mastery of English is something wonderful even in an age of masters when the language was still a mother-tongue and not a contrivance of pedants and grammarians. He had a reverential sense of "our divine Homer's depth and gravity which will not open itself to the curious austerity of belabouring art, but only to the natural and most ingenious souls of our thrice-sacred Poesy." His task was as holy to him as a version of Scripture: he justifies the tears of Achilles by those of Jesus, and the eloquence of his horse by that of Balaam's less noble animal. He is especially great in the similes. Here he rouses himself always, and if his enthusiasm sometimes led him to heighten a little, or even to add outright, he gives us a picture full of life and action, or of the grandeur and beauty of Nature, as stirring to the fancy as his original.'

It is in a similarly reverential and religious spirit, as we have said, that Lowell himself approaches the greatest of the Immortals. To Dante, as he declares, the suffrages of highest authority would assign the second place in the literary hierarchy. He was a man whom an American might well admire; for if his genius was purified and ennobled by sorrows and disappointments, it was because he had stooped to take an active part in the politics of the ungrateful city which exiled him. The poet of the 'Inferno' was a zealous patriot, deeply concerned for the welfare of his Florentine commonwealth, and taking broad and statesmanlike views of the society by which he was proscribed. Through all the foreign and domestic troubles that devastated Florence, the features have been preserved in an eloquently impressive effigy of the partisan who with the serene impartiality of a judge distributed rewards and apportioned punishments to the most famous of his contemporaries. Among the illustrious dead whose statues surround the courtyard of the Florentine Museum

'is one figure before which every scholar, every man who has been touched by the tragedy of life, lingers with reverential pity. The haggard cheeks, the lips clamped together in unfaltering resolve, the scars of lifelong battle, and the brow, whose stern outline seems the trophy of final victory—this, at least, is a face that needs no name beneath it.'

In no essay, or series of essays, is Mr. Lowell more suggestive than in his elaborate study of Dante. He shows us a man who has left his mark for all time by the indefatigable cultivation of phenomenal gifts. Like St. Aldegonde, Dante looked forward to his rest elsewhere, and labour was a duty, a distraction, and a consolation. Unlike Shakespeare, he took infinite pains with the monument which he foresaw would endure to eternity. More versatile even than Leonardo di Vinci, he cultivated, as mere recreations, the music and the painting in which he might have excelled. Like Bacon—although Europe was scarcely emerging from the ignorance of the dark ages—he had taken all science for his province. The books which Shakespeare, on sufficiently flimsy evidence, may be presumed to have studied, might be counted on the fingers. Dante's library, on the contrary, as Mr. Lowell gathers from the references and quotations in his works, must have been miscellaneous and exhaustive. He had travelled much; he had studied in many universities in Italy and abroad; and he had made the acquaintance of many eminent men of letters. Indeed, nothing but his intense individuality could have saved him from being demoralised by contact with the schoolmen, the pedants, and the doctrinaires. He was a soldier who had seen service, and a courtier familiar with courts. In fact, genius, with universal knowledge and almost as universal experience, had alike fitted him successfully to attempt a flight as venturesome as that of Milton's Satan. His writings are inspired by intense actuality; for, as Mr. Lowell observes, the central point in all of them is the writer's own commanding personality. And his personality was strange and very exceptional. Like the late Laurence Oliphant—if we may compare a grand man with a man relatively small—he was at once a shrewd man of business and a mystic. Like Oliphant, he believed himself to have received a direct commission from Heaven. Consequently, the 'Commedia' was a revival and revolution in literature, because Christianity again came to the front, and the poem was the expression of the writer's convictions. Giving the rein to the intellect in every other sphere, Dante was as far as possible from being a freethinker. Recognising the fallibility and criminality of the Popes, he had no toleration for heretics. Moreover, as he said, he regarded 'prudence as the chief of the cardinal virtues,' and did not care to come into inevitable conflict with the spiritual authorities who burned Savonarola. Dante had

in him the stuff which makes martyrs; but he knew his value, and would not have gone to the stake on speculative doctrines open to controversy. At the same time, on questions of moral teaching there is no thought of compromise. With a force that was all his own, and the vigour trenching on brutality which belonged to the age, he brought home to self-deluding sinners the penalties that eternal justice had ordained.

'Dante's age demanded very palpable and even revolting types. As in the old legend, a drop of scalding sweat from the damned soul must shrivel the very skin of those for whom he wrote, to make them wince, if not to turn away, from evil doing. . . . His hell is a condition of the soul: and he could not find images loathsome enough to express the moral deformity which is wrought by sin on its victims, or his own abhorrence of it.'

* As to the interpretation of his allegories, it seems to us a natural but idle expenditure of ingenuity when Mr. Lowell tries to find consistent solutions of them. Even sacred inspiration did not care to elucidate its full meaning for human comprehension, but left much to the interpretation of Faith or Imagination. Like the prophets and the vision-seer of the Apocalypse and the author of the 'Faerie 'Queen,' Dante, the mystic, gave expression to much but vaguely realised by himself. Indeed, Mr. Lowell sums up the whole question as satisfactorily as may be when he says that, while most men remain outside their work, there are others who, like Dante, make their individuality felt in every part of it. Dante was, in practical matters, the man of his time; but when his transcendent genius rose into the realms of the imagination, it saw visions and dreamed dreams which, in less ecstatic moments, the poet himself might have been puzzled to interpret.

Shakespeare is placed upon a still higher pedestal. The grand Florentine was a man of wide cultivation and of many experiences. The poet of Stratford was a genius by inspiration. Taught at a country grammar school, growing up, as tradition tells us, in the society of scapegraces and dissipated rustics, it is a question what books he found leisure to read, and his library, at the best, must have been very limited. Philosophy and metaphysics had come to him by inspiration; his happily chosen metaphors and effects indicate the delicate shades of the characters he depicts; and the most dramatic pictures formed themselves by magical reflection on his mental retina. He scattered his pearls broadcast in his lightly composed plays, and showered his roses at random in

the English sweetness of his sonnets. It is only natural that his worshippers, as in the case of Dante, should have tried to divine hidden meanings of which the one poet was probably as unconscious as the other. Mr. Lowell's analyses of 'Hamlet' and of the 'Tempest' are masterpieces of ingenuity, though, like some of his interpretations of the 'Inferno,' they are more suggestive than satisfactory. And in his notices of 'Macbeth' he makes exceedingly clever points as to the lines descriptive of the arrival of the king at the castle which was to be the scene of the terrible tragedy. To Lady Macbeth brooding over the impending crime, the croak of the raven was ominously significant; whereas to Banquo, knowing nothing of his entertainers' purpose, the bright scenery and the fresh air were suggestive of a hospitable welcome.

But Mr. Lowell, in his excessive admiration and his philological enthusiasm, begins his essay with a startling assertion, which sounds very like a paradox, and is scarcely to be taken seriously. He declares boldly that it may be doubted whether any language be rich enough to maintain more than one really great poet. Perhaps he comes nearer to the truth, writing as a zealous philologist, when he asserts that there is but a short space in the life of any language when such a phenomenon as a great poet is possible. The arguments he uses to establish the proposition as to Shakespeare are undoubtedly extremely interesting. He shows the importance of pure and strong language to full and free poetical expression. He dwells upon Shakespeare's happy fortune in having flourished in the golden reign of Elizabeth, and in his having had Spenser as a forerunner to prepare the way for him. He is far more fanciful when he congratulates the poet on having had a Saxon father and a Norman mother. We suspect that the Ardens, for all their Norman blood, spoke and spelled eccentrically in crabbed calligraphy, very like the elder Shakespeare, the Saxon woolstapler of Stratford. But we must admire the singularly felicitous metaphor by which he illustrates the exquisite proportions of the component parts of English in the later years of Elizabeth.

'In the experiments made for casting the great bell for the Westminster Tower, it was found that the superstition which attributed the remarkable sweetness and purity of tone in certain old bells to the larger mixture of silver in their composition had no foundation in fact. It was the cunning proportion in which the ordinary metals were balanced against each other, the perfection of form, and the nice gradations of thickness that wrought the miracle. And it is precisely

so with the language of poetry. The genius of the poet will tell him what word to use; and even then, unless the proportion and form, whether of parts or whole, be all that Art requires, and the most sensitive taste finds satisfaction in, he will have failed to make what shall have vibrated through all parts with a silvery unison—in other words, a poem.'

The essay on Spenser, with the disquisition on the artificial style and inflated diction of the writers who had more immediately preceded him, illustrates Lowell's conscientious study of our literature. With all his sympathies for the divine and beautiful, he had the patience to sift whole bushels of chaff, and with all his wit he wearied himself over dull and pedantic conceits. The greater is the warmth of his gratitude to Edmund Spenser, who did more than any one to bring our poetry into harmony with Nature, and to set an example of simple eloquence in natural expression. Yet he thinks that, had Sidney lived longer, he might have done even more than his friend to educate the taste and refine the vocabulary of his contemporaries and followers.

'The better of his pastoral poems in the "Arcadia" are, in my judgement, more simple, more natural, and, above all, more pathetic than those of Spenser, who sometimes strains the shepherd's pipe with a blast that would better suit the trumpet. Sidney had the good sense to recognise that it was unsophisticated sentiment rather than rusticity of phrase that befitted such themes. He recognised the distinction between simplicity and vulgarity which Wordsworth was so long in finding out, and seems to have discerned the fact that there is but one kind of English that is always appropriate and never obsolete—namely, the very best.'

Mr. Lowell's fastidiousness as to language as the vehicle of expression almost amounts to a mania; and when he follows Spenser in his excursions through the Land of Faery, as he says himself, he is hurried irresistibly along by his smooth flow of the measure, and the musical felicity of the diction, as much as by the beauty and force of the similes and the mellow versatility of the pictures. The majority of even Spenser's more ardent admirers are less happily constituted, and would regard Mr. Lowell's praise as excessive. If they were to confess the truth, we fear they would have to avow that while they have lingered over those passages of an exquisite charm which impress themselves unconsciously on the memory, they have yawned over much vague and fine-drawn allegory, have skipped passages that are marred by Elizabethan affectations, and possibly have left whole pages unread.

The criticism on Professor Masson's 'Life of Milton,' being written by the author of the 'Biglow Papers' with a pen dipped in gall, is capital reading. As we said, Mr. Lowell has no patience with those he considers as incompetent volunteers, who thrust themselves into the office of the priesthood and profane the sacred shrines. He is hard on Milton's conscientious and industrious biographer; but then he is singularly intolerant of prolixity, though perhaps he should have more fellow-feeling for discursiveness. But in his reverence for the great poets, what really irritates him is the familiarity with which Milton is treated. 'Milton,' he says, 'is the last man to be slapped on the back with impu-'nity.' So Hosea Biglow makes wicked but delightful fun of passages which he picks out in profusion. And as two of a trade notoriously never agree, he resents Professor Masson's analysis of Milton's philology and his metre. There are exceptions to all rules, and 'the necessities of metre need 'not be taken into account with a poet like Milton, who 'never was fairly in his element till he got off the soundings 'of prose, and felt the long swell of his verse under him like 'a steed that knows his rider.' We agree with him that carpings over vowels and syllables are altogether out of place, when Satan is winging his dusky flight over Chaos, or when the rebel angels, driven back from their assault on heaven, lie prostrate and grovelling in the lake of fire. But the secret of all the critical bitterness is to be found in the statement that Mr. Masson's discussions of Milton's English are for the most part unsatisfactory to Mr. Lowell.

There is no more discriminating essay than that on 'Dryden,' though in a reaction against Dryden's many detractors, it possibly does more than justice to his character, and is somewhat sophistical in its defence of his principles and political consistency. As a poet 'Glorious John' is placed first in the second class; although probably Mr. Lowell may be of opinion that there are passages which would vindicate his pretensions to a higher rank. On the other hand, if he often sank far beneath himself, allowance must be made for his circumstances, in which the question of morality comes in. As Laureate 'to a ribald 'king and court,' as political pamphleteer in poetry who had to earn his wage, he wrote to order and he wrote in fetters. His plays, in especial, are a strange medley of faults, beauties, and blemishes. Yet the scenes that are most conventional, and sometimes absurd, are illuminated by unexpected flashes of genius. Mr. Lowell is an excellent judge

of satire, and he pronounces Dryden as a satirist, in some respects unrivalled. And although he had been envenomed by burning political controversy himself, he expresses approval of his satire of Dryden because it is free from malice and always good-natured. In fact, Dryden, who was a sensualist and *bon vivant*, and loved his ease, whether in the chair in the sunny balcony or in the warm chimney corner, had a great deal of the Gallio in him. He chanted triumphal odes and advocated creeds and political causes professionally; but personally he cared for little beyond a quiet life. He has said virtually, in his own essay on the subject, that the secret of effective satire is to keep the temper, and with his somewhat apathetic temperament he found it easy to practise what he taught. Virulent invective, he declares, comes easily to anybody: but nothing is more difficult than to make a man to seem knavish or foolish without the employment of abusive language. He said that he had formed his style on Tillotson's. Mr. Lowell remarks shrewdly that he seems rather to have got it at Wills's, for its charm is that it has the various freedom of talk. With regard to which we may add that, if Shakespeare had the good fortune to write in the golden prime of the English language, 'Glorious John' was no less happy in being the king of the great literary coffee-house, and the unquestioned dictator of intellectual coteries. As he sat, laying down the law and listening to his courtiers in a gay, witty, and fashionable company, drawn together by the attractions of literature and the cost of fuel, to the last the veteran kept up a course of training specially adapted to the developement of his special powers.

We may presume that Mr. Lowell was proud of his serious poems, otherwise he would not have reprinted so many or so carefully collected fugitive and early pieces. But, to tell the truth, as a serious poet he has slight pretensions to immortality, although here and again with his profound feeling he strikes a singularly pathetic chord. His fame rests on his metrical satires, and the most telling of them can only be described as humorous doggerel. The 'Fable 'for Critics' was a sparkling *jeu d'esprit*, dashed off, as he tells us, for his own amusement, and with no thought of publication. He was induced to print it by the urgent persuasions of a friend. Perhaps it would have been well for his peace of mind had he refused. Clever as it was, it was almost as little fitted for publicity as the unreserved self-confidences of a private journal. He criticised and

satirised contemporaries and illustrious rivals with admirable terseness, felicity, and truth. Consequently, he cut sundry ties of friendship, and changed not a few kindly admirers into resentful enemies. Yet the temptation to publish was strong, for many of the touches are as discriminating as they are incisively telling. One of the best of the sketches is that of Bryant—

> 'As quiet, as cool and as dignified,
> As a smooth, silent iceberg that never is ignified,
> Save when by reflection 't is kindled o' nights,
> With a semblance of flame by the chill Northern Lights.'

Nor is that of Lowell himself the worst or the least candid—

> 'There is Lowell, who's striving Parnassus to climb
> With a whole bale of *isms* tied together with rhyme.
> He might get on alone, spite of brambles and boulders,
> But he can't with that bundle he has on his shoulders.
> The top of the hill he will ne'er come nigh reaching
> Till he learns the distinction 'twixt singing and preaching.

He tells himself in the preface to the collected 'Biglow Papers how his success came as a surprise, and how he gradually awakened to the sense of unrealised responsibilities, which partly paralysed him when he found he was wielding a weapon in place of trifling with a switch. In the introduction to the second series of the 'Biglow Papers' he gives his own conception of their scope and purpose. He feared to vulgarise deep and sound convictions, and found it was time to doff the cap and bells.

> 'I needed, on occasion, to rise above the level of mere *patois*, and for this purpose conceived the Rev. Mr. Wilbur, who should express the more cautious element of the New England character and its pedantry, as Mr. Biglow should serve for its homely common sense, vivified and heated by conscience. The parson was to be the complement rather than the antithesis of his parishioners.'

What was at once the strength and the weakness of 'the 'Papers' was their intense earnestness. We have seen him quote with approval the rule laid down by Dryden that to be effective the satirist must keep his temper. Lowell brought so much passion to his work when he had realised its importance in political warfare, that he is sometimes hurried into excessive violence. The violence is not so much directed against persons as employed in the advocacy of sound principles carried to extremes. The man of the world becomes inconsistently unpractical, and the Quaker hits out right and left. But though the critic of the collected satires detects these faults, they were admirably fitted to

work upon an excited democracy. The typical man of peace at any price reads his New Testament literally. On his principles the Mexicans, instead of losing Texas, might have pushed their operations to the head waters of the Mississippi without any armed opposition from Uncle Sam.

> 'Ez for war, I call it murder—
> There you hev it plain an' flat;
> I don't want to go no further
> Than my Testyment for that.
> God has said so plump and fairly,
> It's ez long as it is broad,
> An' you've got to git up airly
> Ef you want to take in God.'

And in one of Mr. Wilbur's numerous postscripts he goes the length of an absolute *reductio ad absurdum* in satirising General Scott's claims to the Presidency as having caused the destruction of more Mexicans than any other commander. We are not concerned now about the almost forgotten origin of the Mexican quarrel, for Lowell's argument is that war is invariably criminal. Yet, before he wrote the second series, after an interval of twenty years, the Secession had revolutionised his convictions. He had clung to the letter of the New Testament and strained it: now, in his patriotic and political fervour against the Southerners, he is breathing threatenings and slaughter, and preaching extermination in the spirit of the Hebrew prophets. He has gone back to the Old Testament with a vengeance, and is bitterly indignant against English statesmen because, in a very modified form, they held to something like his earlier views. We have another proof of his unconsidered vehemence in his indulging through this second series, more or less, in the personalities which are the favourite weapons in American party strife. He pleads that, in order to point his satire, he must single out representative sinners for special flaying, although Dryden, to whose dictum he had assented, thought differently. In fact, he agrees with gruff old Johnson, who told Boswell it was a mistake in controversy to be respectful to your adversary, because that lent him dignity in the eyes of the looker-on.

It says much for Mr. Lowell's honourable candour that he reprints passages which are little to the credit of his prescience. He sneers amusingly enough at Calhoun for meeting abolitionist movements in Congress with the familiar scarecrow of a dissolution of the Union. He smiles at Calhoun's trying to anchor South Carolina to the shoals of the Past with a pack-thread cable and a crooked pin.

How little the loather of war can have foreseen the battle-fields heaped with the dead and dying from Bull's Run to Manasses Junction! As little did he foresee the momentous social questions, waiting solution, when the emancipated blacks should multiply phenomenally in a congenial climate, threatening to swamp the flow of civilisation in a counter-flood. But some of Mr. Wilbur's remarks on the slave scandal are irresistibly droll, as when the witty divine, who is saturated with Scripture, observes: 'It was said of old 'time that riches have wings; and though this be not ap-'plicable in a literal sense to the wealth of our patriarchal 'brethren in the South, yet it is clear that their possessions 'have legs, and an unaccountable propensity for using them 'in a northern direction.' Severe as he was on the South-erners, he nevertheless recognised that they were defending their property, taking their stand on their traditional pre-judices, and fighting, in fact, for social existence. He reserved the full fury of his indignation for their allies in the North, who prostituted conscience to party, and held a blazing candle to Satan. He never wrote more scathing satires than those on time-serving editors and time-serving candidates. The letter from the candidate for the Presi-dency to Mr. Biglow might be commended to the perusal of the constituents of many gentlemen who, like the blind guided by the blind, follow the lead of Mr. Gladstone's obsequious lieutenants.

'So, to begin at the beginnin'
An' come directly to the pint;
I think the country's underpinnin'
Is some considerable out o' jint.
I ain't agoin' to try your patience
By tellin' who does this or that,
I don't make no insinovations,
I jest let on I smell a rat.
That is, I mean it seems to me so,
But if the public think I'm wrong,
I won't deny but what I be so,
An', fact, it don't smell very strong.

. . . . .

Ez to the answerin' o' questions,
I'm an off ox at being druv,
Though I ain't one that any toil shuns,
'll give our folks a helpin' shove.
Kind o' permiscoous I go it
For the hole country, an' the ground
I take as nigh as I can show it,
Is pooty gen'ally all round.'

Of course the point of the letter is in the postscript, for corruption flourishes, like cotton in the Carolina swamps, under the enlightened constitution of the States. The commentary on the candidate's definite profession of faith is the conditional promise of an appointment to Jaalam lighthouse. As for Mr. Sawin's personal candidature for the White House, it is burlesque and extravaganza rather than satire; but there are delightful passages in it. He hits off to a hair the democratic weakness for a telling epithet, such as that which carried so many votes for 'Old Hickory,' and which, failing anything better, was contented to familiarise the adored President Lincoln as 'Old Abe.' Mr. Sawin, it will be remembered, came back from the Mexican campaign deplorably shattered in health and body and with but a single leg.

'Then you can call me Timbertoes, that's what the people likes,
Su'thin' combinin' morril truth with phancies such as strikes.'

. . . . . .

'Old Timbertoes, you see, 's a creed it's safe to be quite bold on,
There's nothin' in 't the other side can anyways get hold on.'

But, as nothing hits harder than exact though unwelcome truth, the most telling lines are those on the gradual conversion by circumstances of the smooth-tongued and plausible American 'Whigs.'

'Truth is, the cutest leadin' Whigs, ever sence fust they found
Wich side the bread gut buttered on, hev kep' a edgin' round;
They kin' o' slipt the planks from out th' ole platform one by one,
An' made it gradooally new 'fore folks know'd wut was done,
Till fur'z I know there ain't an inch thet I could lay my han' on;
But I, or any Demmercrat, feels comf'table to stand on,
An' ole Whig doctrines act'lly look, their occ'pants bin' gone,
Lonesome ez steddles on a marsh without no hayricks on.'

Mr. Sawin's Mexican experiences came as an unnecessary aggravation to the invariable difficulty of recruiting native Americans for foreign service. The pay has been raised since then; but Mr. Sawin, though his moral sense was undeveloped, felt that ninepence a day came low for murder. He was hurt to find that his officers ordered him about, in place of standing drinks in kindly good-fellowship or accepting them; and from his dreams of glory he awakened to learn that the glory 'lodged' long before it got so low as the rank and file. In fact, it was his coming home a hopeless invalid and a cripple that induced him to turn his thoughts to politics and the Presidency. His purse is low, but he

feels it is an indispensable preliminary that he should become a slaveowner, even if he can only pick up a low-priced black baby. Such a species of slaveholding would be simply consistent with the other sham pretensions of every eligible candidate. And his chase of the runaway nigger in the bush, the capture of Pompey with his promising offspring—each child of them worth twenty dollars in the market—the turning of the tables and the captive's subsequent emancipation as being incorrigibly idle and not worth his keep—are all excellent fooling in broad comedy. All the better that here and there is a very pretty touch of pathos.

'An' even he looked, I vow he groaned ez though he'd broke his heart,
He done it like a w'ite man, too, ez nat'ral ez a pictur'.'

The second series of the 'Papers,' like almost all sequels, must be pronounced to be comparatively a failure. Mr. Lowell seems to acknowledge as much when he pleads that self-consciousness had been growing upon him, and that, having learned to write anonymously, he felt himself hampered at every turn. The writing is less spontaneous: indeed, it reads like effort instead of play. His patriotism had been blown up to a white heat by the burning passions excited by the Civil War, and perhaps, as Englishmen, we are prejudiced against that series by the severity—and we may add the unfairness—of the attacks on England. We can understand that any Northern man should have keenly resented the assumed carelessness that permitted the escape of the 'Alabama' and her consorts; or the unsympathetic haste with which one at least of the leading Liberal statesmen assumed the inevitable success of the Secession. But we should have believed that Mr. Lowell would have judged more dispassionately the action of our Government in the matter of the 'Trent.' Be that as it may, if a man of his intelligence was so perversely blinded by national prejudice, we can conceive and fathom the vehement feelings of his ignorant and infuriated countrymen.

It is pleasanter to turn to Mr. Sawin's grotesque and laughable experiences among the Southern slaveholders. Laughable to us, though not to him. But that ragged and absolutely unprejudiced philosopher had learned the art of putting the best face on things. If misfortune hits him hard, he knocks under and 'hollers,' and is content to bide his time. Probably he was conscious that neither his rags, his looks, nor his New England drawl were satisfactory vouchers

to character. In the spirit of good-fellowship he drops into a tavern, where a gentleman, drawing a revolver, charges him with the theft of a missing nigger. As he is 'all the 'stranger that's around,' no time is allowed for setting up a defence of mistaken identity. It is a case of summary Jedwood justice. An infuriated Grand Jury sits on him after he has been tried, condemned, and punished. A general goes for a feather bed, and it is the judge who warms the tar. Tarred and feathered, he is ridden on a rail to the gaol, where he is to be entertained indefinitely at the cost of the community. Years roll by and his innocence is made clear. Nothing can be more gratifying than the honours paid to the innocent. A colonel offers to shoot him at sight, if he cares to take satisfaction in that shape, and promises, moreover, to give the black cause of the misunderstanding 'a most h—— fired licking,' should he ever be caught. He has to pay a trifle for the feathers and the tar, but no charge is made for the ride and the other fixings. For these descendants of English cavaliers look as closely to the cents and the dimes as any Massachusetts pedlar of wooden nutmegs. And after all the liquor has been chalked up to Mr. Sawin—it showed a childlike confidence if they hoped to be paid for it—they proceed to pass such a series of resolutions as may be found in the pages of 'Martin Chuzzlewit.' In fact, if we seek a lively picture of the peculiarities of Southern manners and 'institutions,' we should set a satirical Northerner to paint it, and *vice versa.*

We cannot dismiss the second series without noticing the prefatory disquisition on language. The defence of the New England dialects of the American is a masterly piece of learned philological work, redeemed from anything like dulness by perpetual flashes of humour. Mr. Lowell demonstrates that many of the words and expressions which we are accustomed to regard as vulgar colloquialisms are really good and pure old English. When Mr. Biglow seems most familiar and homely, he may be speaking Chaucer and Spenser. Yet it is precisely owing to our habitual association with the language of modern English culture that the defence, ingenious as it is, seems rather sophistical than satisfactory. We readily give in to such examples as 'Fall' for the autumn; but in many cases corruption has evidently been at work, and has changed the character of some venerable phrase or word, as it has taken unfortunate liberties with the phonetic spelling. But nowhere does Mr. Lowell

show more surprisingly the marvellous range of his miscellaneous reading, as well as the tenacity and method of an extraordinarily well-disciplined memory. If we doubted the continuity of life beyond the grave, we should find a strong argument for it in the difficulty of believing that such intellectual treasures as men like Lowell have been industriously accumulating should be wasted and dissipated at the touch of death.

He declared that he always hated politics, and the political addresses are, for the most part, but the formal expression in prose of the opinions broached far more effectively in his satires. The best worth reading is the address on 'Democracy,' when, in 1884, he spoke to a Birmingham audience in a tone which can hardly have failed to strike them by its novelty. It pleases him to describe 'Democracy' as a topic of comparatively abstract interest, and he secures himself full latitude of demonstration by undertaking to generalise his remarks. He avows himself a Conservative by temperament and education. Conservative as he was, his speech resolves itself into a defence of the material and social results of democratic expansion in the States. He had heard the ruin of Massachusetts confidently predicted by a sagacious political seer, when, in 1840, the property qualification for the suffrage was abolished. It was believed to have put public credit and private property alike at the mercy of penniless demagogues. Twenty years later he saw the Commonwealth making extraordinary efforts and sacrifices to keep faith with its creditors. He gives the explanation in characteristically homely form, with a reference to the familiar proverbial philosophy which was likely to recommend itself to his listeners. Of course, as he was talking of the State of Massachusetts, he has nothing to say of such scandals as those of the Tammany Ring. 'The beggar is in the saddle at last,' cries Proverbial Wisdom. 'Why, in the name of all former experience, doesn't he ride to the devil? Because, in the very act of mounting, he ceased to be a beggar, and became part-owner of the piece of property he bestrides.' As for the literary addresses, many of them are models in their way, for he spoke with the fluent eloquence of an American on subjects in which he was profoundly interested, and as to which he was exceptionally well informed. He was flattered by no ordinary compliments when asked to unveil in England the statues of Coleridge and of Fielding, and when he was invited to speak to the memory of his friend Dean Stanley at the

commemorative meeting in the Chapter House of Westminster Abbey.

We are inclined to associate Lowell with books and libraries, platforms and drawing-rooms,—and it is partly his own fault. We began with a brief notice of his 'Moosehead 'Journal,' but he has written far too little on rural subjects. Yet he tells us, in 'My Garden Acquaintance,' that he has lived all his life in the country, and almost in the same spot. With his light touch and his playful fancy he has made it perhaps the most attractive of his articles. He formed friendships with guests in fur and feathers almost as close as those of White of Selborne, whom he so dearly loves and genially ridicules.

'Mr. White seems never to have had any harder work to do than to study the habits of his feathered fellow townfolk, or to watch the ripening of his peaches on the wall. He seems to have lived before the Fall His volumes are the journal of Adam in Paradise,

"Annihilating all that's made
To a green thought in a green shade."

'. . . No rumour of the revolt of the American colonies appears to have reached him. "The natural term of a hog's life" has more interest for him than the fall of an empire. Burgoyne may surrender and welcome; of what consequence is *that* compared with the fact that he can explain the odd tumbling of rooks in the air by their turning over to scratch themselves with one claw? . . . I believe he would gladly have consented to be eaten by a tiger or a crocodile if by that means the presence within the parish limits of either of those anthropophagous beasts could have been established. He brags of no fine society, but is plainly elated by "having considerable acquaintance with a tame barn owl." '

And hear Mr. Lowell on the old Sussex tortoise and its biographer:—

'It is clear White fell in love with it at first sight. We have no means of tracing the growth of his passion; but in 1780 we find him eloping with its object in a postchaise, and "the bustle and hurry of the journey so perfectly roused it that when I turned it out in a border it walked twice down to the bottom of my garden." It reads like a "Court Journal:"—"Yesterday morning H.R.H. the Princess Alice took an airing on the terrace of Windsor Castle." '

Going back across the Atlantic to Mr. Lowell's own garden and grounds in New England, we are reminded on each page of Sir Edward Hamley in 'Our Poor Relations,' with whom Hamley sympathises so heartily. Like White or Hamley, we fancy Mr. Lowell must have found gardens and orchards a snare and a distraction. He would leave the

Fathers, the classics, or his satires at any moment for the irresistible attraction of the scream of a blue jay or the melodious mimicry of the cat-bird. Like White, he made continual notes, or rather, as he modestly calls them, *mémoires pour servir*. Though devoted to his birds, he does not flatter them. He does not believe in their marvellous prescience as meteorologists. The migrants often make fatal mistakes in their faith in an ordinary procession of the seasons. But he likes them none the worse that they are no wiser than himself. The familiar robin seems to be his favourite. The American robin is sometimes in the habit of wintering abroad, or at least of betaking himself to the woods or forests, and so his appearance in the garden is welcomed as a presage of immediate spring. But if the thermometer should unexpectedly relapse below zero, the robin is not only content, but cheerful. He is given to gormandising, or rather to gluttony, and so practical market gardeners consider him a pest. As for Lowell, who is indifferent to dessert, he would rather sacrifice his raspberries than his robins. 'He keeps a strict eye 'on your fruit, and knows to a shade of purple when 'your grapes have cooked long enough in the sun.' Apropos to which, as Artemus Ward would have said, Lowell relates a little anecdote. There had been a protracted drought, and the robins had disappeared. He rather congratulated himself on the eclipse, for a cherished grape vine, somewhat shy of bearing, had been covering itself with tempting clusters. He watched them anxiously, and waited for the perfection of the vintage.

'But the robins somehow had kept note of them. They must have sent out spies, as did the Jews into the Promised Land, before I was stirring. When I went with my basket, at least a dozen of these winged intriguers bustled out from among the leaves, and, alighting on the nearest trees, exchanged some remarks about me of a derogatory nature. They had fairly sacked the vine.'

Then the cat-birds are as shy as the robins are the reverse. The cat-bird takes his tithes of the fruits, but he more than atones for his thefts by his minstrelsy. Even their rehearsals are pleasant, and their practice is melodious. 'They differ 'greatly in vocal talent, but all have a delightful way of 'croning over, and, as it were, rehearsing the song in an 'undertone.' There is a tale of the blue jays which is good, and would seem still better, did we not remember Mark Twain's inimitable apologue of the consultations over the bottomless hole in his 'Innocents Abroad.' It is comical to hear of the crows being victims to the tender passion; and

Mr. Lowell remarks that their persistent efforts to soften their croaking into sentiment and sighs remind him of a Mississippi boatman quoting Tennyson. Besides the cat-birds and the blue jays, the American gardens have sundry brilliant visitors, which are seldom or never seen in our islands. The orioles are flashing and flitting through the foliage, and swinging in hammocks slung to the pendulous boughs. Now and then the bobolink would appear, the most irrepressible of rapturous vocalists, and shaking surrounding creation like the corncrake, as he trills out his tenor-like solos from dawn till dusk. And on that rural concert we may let down the curtain. It is pleasant to think of the accomplished scholar, the satirist, and the diplomatist, in failing health and in the fall of life, still finding innocent enjoyment in the country where he was born, till death stole quietly upon him like a thief in the night, and he was peacefully gathered to his Puritan forefathers.

---

ART. V.—*Fortification.* By Major G. S. CLARKE, R.E., C.M.G. 8vo. London: 1891.

MAJOR CLARKE has taken upon himself a serious responsibility. Fortification has hitherto been looked upon as a science so abstruse and technical, so full of details, and involving so intimate a knowledge of cognate arts, building, architecture, and the like, that, with few exceptions, even educated soldiers have been content to leave it in the hands of those who receive a special training in the construction of defensive works. The ordinary civilian, interest himself as he may in other branches of the military art, makes no attempt to rush in where those better qualified than himself forbear to tread. Nor have the Engineers encouraged the uninitiated to intrude upon their domain. They have doubtless considered it impossible for anyone who lacks technical training to acquire more than the little knowledge which is proverbially so dangerous. But fortification, in step with other branches of the military art, is in process of transformation. As is the case with strategy and tactics, general principles still hold good; but improvements in firearms and more powerful explosives have wrought havoc amongst details which have hitherto been believed to be indispensable. The tendency of this process is towards simplification, and an officer of the Royal Engineers now declares that fortification is more a question of common sense than

of bricks and mortar; that not only soldiers who are without technical training may easily learn how to employ the art in its most effective form, but that men who have no practical knowledge of military affairs may be trusted to give intelligent judgement on the problems which have hitherto constituted the preserve of the engineer. In effect, not only officers of those arms of the service who would have to defend the works which the sapper constructs, but the civilians who pay for the construction of those works, are invited to penetrate the arcana and to inspire the oracle. The book before us has been writ'en

> in the hope of aiding the solution of some difficulties, of clearing away some of the cobwebs in which fortification lies half smothered, and of attracting a larger class of thinkers to a subject which has no real mysteries. The intelligence with which military questions are discussed has markedly increased of late years; and the more that intelligence can be developed, the less will be the risks of those mistakes of policy for which a nation pays dearly. (P. vii.)

The author complains that the number of works on fortification in the English language is but small. It is possible, indeed, that the volume now before us will scarcely fill, for the English student, the place of the sumptuous volumes which annually appear in Paris and Brussels; but we doubt whether the dry bones of the science have ever been clothed with a more brilliant texture. For the first time, fortification is presented in a guise which fascinates rather than repels. Even were the object one of less importance to the Empire, the vivid style, the clear explanation of general principles, the searching criticism, and the historical illustrations with which Major Clarke's work abounds, will, doubtless, attract many others besides military readers; and those who believe it necessary to hold decided views on the questions of the day will now be induced to frame their own conclusions whenever questions of fortification are brought before the public. It is needless to say that these conclusions will, in default of extended knowledge, be those which are so ably expounded by the writer who first introduced them to the subject. It will be well, therefore, if we endeavour to estimate the worth of the volume before us as an educational medium. Of its literary merits we have said enough; even the spice of satire which seasons these pages detracts in no wise from their intrinsic value, although the very abundance of this seasoning may raise a suspicion that the writer is sometimes more intent on demolishing the

theories of others than on proving the superiority of his own.

The book is divided into two distinct parts, inland fortresses and coast defences. As regards the latter, we may say at once that Major Clarke has crystallised principles and defined opinions which for some years have been floating in solution. This portion of his work, dealing with construction rather than destruction, has been done temperately and conclusively. The first portion, however, dealing with a question of more general importance, and of far older standing, than that of coast defence, is chiefly an endeavour to clear the way, to demonstrate the futility of the old methods, and the useless expense of those which have been proposed to supersede them. The task is here a hundredfold more difficult. Major Clarke cannot certainly be accused of shirking it. So vigorous an onslaught on the teaching of the past has been seldom made. But it may be fairly questioned whether the very vehemence of his attack has not introduced some confusion in his array of arguments; whether a more deliberate observation of his opponent's position would not have shown that there are certain points which are absolutely unassailable.

The conclusion with respect to inland fortresses to which he comes is that

'a Plevna (complete in all that time and labour render possible), properly armed and fully organised, will fulfil all the requirements of defence, and, whatever may be the advances in the weapons of attack, can never become either so hopelessly inadequate, or so difficult to renovate, as now are most of the masterpieces of the schoolmen.'

Now our objection to this terse summing up of the whole case is that Plevna, properly speaking, was not a fortress at all. It was an entrenched position, held by 40,000 veteran soldiers, fresh from three years of successful service in Servia, under a chief they loved and trusted, accompanied by officers who, in their late campaigns, had acquired a wide practical experience in the construction of defensive works. A fortress, on the other hand, is generally defined as lines which, covering an arsenal, a dockyard, a road, or a river, can be held by either a small garrison or by a force of inferior or demoralised troops, leaving the field-army free to manœuvre in other quarters of the theatre of war. Tel-el-Kebir was an entrenched position. It certainly did not fulfil the definition of a fortress. The castle of

Burgos was a fortress, not, indeed, 'a masterpiece of the schoolmen,' but still protected by a broad ditch, a shot-proof parapet, ingenious flanks, retrenchments, and a *réduit*. Garrisoned by 2,000 men, and armed with 26 pieces of ordnance, it successfully resisted for more than a month the attack of 24,000 British troops, and delayed the Duke's advance into Spain for nearly a whole year.

Engineers are agreed that the defences of a capital, of an arsenal, or of a dockyard should rely in the first instance on a chain of detached forts, surrounding the area to be protected at a distance of several miles from the place itself, and placed at intervals varying from 3,000 to 5,000 yards. Major Clarke proposes that for these forts should be substituted redoubts designed for infantry and machine guns; that the artillery of the defence should be moveable, and be worked in the intervals, supported by the field army. These redoubts, he says, in conjunction with the field defence of the intervals, will amply suffice to render the position incapable of being taken by assault. They are to be permanent, constructed in time of peace, and lacking nothing but their garrisons and armament when war is declared. They are either without ditches or with ditches of which the escarps are no more than 9 feet high, but they contain bomb-proof cover and are protected by an ingenious series of obstacles.

'Land mines can be employed at the foot of the counterscarp (where ditches are made), or a suitable growth of low, prickly shrub might suffice. . . . A good obstacle should be placed on the top of the counterscarp, covered by the glacis. A strong hedge cut down to a level slightly above the crest of the glacis would be very effective. An advanced glacis covering another line of obstacles can be employed if the ground admits. The glacis should be planted with trees, which can be felled when required and interlaced to form *abattis*, while the roots and stumps will effectually prevent sapping. The bottom of the ditch should be planted . . . sub-tropical plants, such as the prickly pear and Spanish bayonet, are admirably adapted for this purpose.'

To these picturesque adjuncts are added an unclimbable sunk fence and strong permanent entanglements on the glacis, and beyond these may be field obstacles and land mines.

A redoubt defended by such a series of natural and artificial impediments, and manned by good troops, may possibly be considered impregnable; but in war events march rapidly, and it is always possible that time and labour would be wanting to construct the abattis, to connect the mines,

or lay out the prickly gardens. Secondly, and this is an important point, it is unwise to calculate on having good troops to man the parapets. The field army cannot be split up so as to protect every point. There will always be certain localities which must be left to the safe keeping of small garrisons, or of troops which correspond to our own militia and volunteers. Under such conditions we still hold that detached forts with high scarps, which form the principal means of defence, are of far more value than redoubts of the above type. The fall of two or three redoubts would jeopardise the safety of the place. Through the gaps thus opened the enemy would pour his attacking columns; or on the heights occupied by the works would find positions for his batteries, probably within range of the town itself. Such works, then, must be absolutely *sturmfrei*, and the only really efficient obstacle is a ditch from which it is physically impossible for men to reach the parapets. The moral strength which such an obstacle would give to a garrison of inferior or demoralised troops is an important factor, but its chief value is that the assailant would have to renounce all idea of seizing the fortress by a *coup de main*. Had he only redoubts in front of him, it is morally certain that such a course would be attempted. Sir Edward Hamley, in his clear and picturesque account of the Crimean campaign, has lately reminded us that

'on the day after the battle of the Alma Sir Edmund Lyons, second in command of the fleet, urged Lord Raglan to follow up the success, and try to take the northern forts [of Sebastopol] by a *coup de main*. But on the highest part of the ground there was the Star Fort, with the trenches and batteries in continuation of it. This fort was a permanent work of 700 yards' extent round the lines of fire; it had escarps of masonry and a glacis, and was surrounded by a ditch twelve feet deep and eighteen feet wide.' *

It is true that Todleben, the great Russian engineer and the hero of the campaign, represents in his account of the siege the storming of this fort, although armed with forty-seven guns, as an easy matter, but, as Sir Edward Hamley very justly observes, 'not only his opinions but his facts are 'frequently more than questionable, and he gives but too 'much reason to infer that he exaggerated the insufficiency 'of the means of resistance in order to assert the importance 'of his own splendid services in enabling the garrison to

* The War in the Crimea, by General Sir Edward Hamley, K.C.B, pp. 68, 71. London: 1891.

'make so memorable a defence.' At the same time it is well to notice that the assault of so strong a work as the Star Fort was thought within the bounds of possibility. Would Major Clarke's infantry redoubts have saved either Sebastopol or Paris? Was not the fact that in both cases the invaders were compelled to sit down to the tedious processes of siege and investment a triumph for permanent fortifications of the massive sort?

The very boldness of the suggestion that it is better to trust to earthen parapets and simple obstacles, to stout hearts and steady rifles, than to massive structures of cement and granite, defended by vast ditches and strengthened by iron cupolas, is fascinating in the extreme. Nor is it difficult to imagine that a leader as confident in his own skill as in the discipline and mettle of his troops, in the efficiency of his staff as in the training of his artillery, in the vigilance of his outposts as in the perfection of his organisation, would make a Plevna or a Petersburg of any position whatsoever. But, as the successful maintenance of any defensive position is, after all, a question of *morale*, it is essential that nothing should be neglected which might increase, or nothing done which might prejudice, that *morale*. Human nature, in all its weakness, has to be considered in fortification as on the field of battle; and the engineer has often to use his art for the benefit of troops of inferior calibre, with leaders new to their work, a hastily selected staff, and an untried system of organisation.

Major Clarke's parting shot at the 'schoolmen,' quoted above, is but the final salvo of a long-continued bombardment. From preface to peroration he is full of denunciations against text-books, professors, theorists, and systems. It would almost seem that he had in his mind's eye the image of some opponent more tenacious of tradition, but perhaps less impulsive than himself; narrower in view, but, it may be, of equally sound judgement. But we cannot agree with his sweeping denunciations of his predecessors. Of his predecessors, we say, for although he prefers earthen slopes and iron railings to cupolas constructed of iron plates and ditches whose scarps are revetted with masonry, he is but the advocate of a system after all, and can scarcely be more of a practical soldier than those who, like himself, have suggested important changes in the art of the engineer.

It is, perhaps, true that, 'by exaggerating the mysteries 'of the science, the sense of proportion is dulled, and real 'military requirements are obscured in futile tricks of

'design;' that, in certain cases, 'after vast sums have 'been swallowed up in excavations and brickworks, all the 'essentials of a fighting position have been found wanting.' But because some of his disciples have forgotten that Vauban, who may be called the father of fortification as practised in modern times, was, above all, a great tactician, that he laid down that in all fortification the lie of the ground is the first thing to be considered, there is no reason that the principles on which he based his system should be ignored.

One of the most marked features, not only of the system which takes its name from the French marshal, but of every other system except that advocated by Major Clarke, is the ditch. His typical redoubts, a series of which are to take the place of the massive structures of masonry and the ditches, at least forty feet in depth, which have hitherto been considered essential to a fortress, have low parapets, without ditches; or if such adjuncts, owing to peculiarities of site or other reasons, are considered absolutely necessary, with unflanked ditches only nine feet deep. Passing by the consideration that a ditch of such dimensions is scarcely an obstacle at all, we may first of all notice that it is proposed to substitute for the ditch an unclimbable sunk fence, and a strong permanent entanglement; and, secondly, that we are asked to believe that these are the most formidable obstacles that can be created. The question arises, Are these obstructions as effective against surprise or a determined assault as the broad ditches with high perpendicular walls, ranging from twenty-four to even sixty feet or more in height, which have hitherto distinguished permanent fortifications? We have no direct experience to guide us. The unclimbable sunk fence, exposed to the full fire of the parapet, has not yet been tried in war. But works have before now been defended by rows of palisading—stout timbers seven feet in height—placed at the bottom of the ditch; and yet so formidable an obstacle as this has not been sufficient to arrest a determined rush. It is an old story that when men's blood is up physical difficulties count for nothing. Many a soldier has taken part in the successful assault of a fortified line who cannot in the least remember how he crossed the material obstacles that to his after reflection appeared almost impassable. Men must understand war very thoroughly indeed before it is possible to pronounce what is an efficient obstacle and what is not. 'Love laughs at locksmiths,' and

the heroism of a storming party has before now mocked the most formidable barriers raised by art or nature.

The greatest difficulty with which the engineer has to contend is the necessity of combining security against surprise and escalade with the power of resisting the operations of a siege. The devices which ensure the one detract from the other. The bastion trace was designed to increase the former. To make escalade impracticable it was found necessary to flank the ditches. But the bastions, effective as they were as a means of defeating an assault, weakened the power of resisting a bombardment, and Vauban, who had himself brought the system into universal use, invariably made the face of the bastion the objective of his attack, for it was the weakest point of the adversary's line. It will doubtless appear to those who favour Major Clarke's ideas that in urging the necessity of a ditch in order to make a work *sturmfrei*, we are but following in Vauban's wake—avoiding Scylla only to fall into Charybdis. A ditch, to be an effective obstacle, must be deep, and the counterscarp at least must be revetted. Now any revetment, if it is liable to be assailed by artillery fire, must be substantial in the extreme, and therefore exceedingly costly. But, unless the site of a work be particularly unfavourable, the counterscarp is seldom exposed to fire, and a detached wall may be added. Provided the counterscarp be high enough to deter the stormers from jumping down, an escarp of earth, at the normal slope, actually strengthens the work.

The question of ditch-flanking Major Clarke considers unimportant, and he ridicules General Brialmont for having discussed it at inordinate length;* but, merely recalling the fact that flanked ditches were in great part responsible for the terrible losses at Badajoz and for the repulse of the first attack on the breach of St. Sebastian,† we would remind him that the great redoubt at Gorny-Dubnik, on the Plevna-Orkanieh road, fell to the Russian guard under Gourko solely in consequence of its unflanked ditch. A smaller earthwork, on the opposite side of the *chaussée*, had been captured early in the day, but all further attempts to advance had been roughly checked.

'Every time the men tried to go forward,' writes the correspondent of the 'Daily News,' 'they either fell, struck by a Turkish ball, or sought

* Fortification du Temps présent. Par le Général Brialmont.

† Guerre de la Péninsule. Par J. Belmas, Chef du Bataillon du Génie. Paris: 1838. Vol. iv. pp. 346, 352-3, 623.

cover at once from the fiendish hail that was thrown in their faces from the great redoubt. Now began a kind of fight never conceived of by the officers, but which the men found, naturally enough, was the only thing to do. They had been ordered by the general, when they advanced, to go into that great square mound of earth that crowned the hill, and they never thought for a moment, but the order must be obeyed. As the day went on a few brave fellows stole out from the captured earthwork, dodged behind first one and then another natural bit of cover, and got into a little house which stood on the west side of the *chaussée*. Now it became the smart thing to do to jump from the little redoubt into the ditch, then rush into the little house. . . . One soldier dared the other; the enterprising spirit of the first one spread like a contagion, and in an hour or two the little house was so full that those who came last of all, out of breath, could find no cover there, and were obliged to go on further, and did go on, and threw themselves into the very ditch of the great redoubt. . . .

'The few who got into the ditch found it the only place where there was perfect shelter, much to their surprise, and beckoned and called the others to follow them, which they did as opportunity offered, until there was quite a force under the very noses of the enemy. The Turks could not fire on them, because to hit them they were obliged to stand up on the parapet, and this was certain death. Beams and stones were playfully thrown over into the ditch, and the Russians responded playfully with lumps of earth and pebbles; but all the time they stayed there they were not idle, for they diligently dug in the steep bank of the ditch steps by which they might reach the parapet. The number of men increased rapidly as night approached, and at last they with one accord clambered up the bank, sprang upon the parapet, and bayoneted the defenders of the redoubt with resistless energy.' *

It is impossible to underrate the efficiency of the ditch as an obstacle, and it would be more than injudicious to neglect this means of affording a garrison absolute security against assault. It has advantages which no other obstacle possesses. If the counterscarp is high, the descent has to be effected by ladders. This is in itself sufficient to break the order and destroy the cohesion of the attacking force. Again, within the ditch itself supplementary obstacles may be provided. 'A deep cut [cunette] made in the bottom of the 'ditch [at Badajoz] was filled with water from the inunda-'tion; into that watery snare the head of the fourth divi-'sion fell, and it is said above a hundred fusileers, the men 'of Albuera, were there smothered.' † It has, moreover, been suggested by Captain Jackson, R.E., that the bottom of the ditch should be paved with concrete, sloping towards

* Daily News War Correspondence, vol. ii. pp. 31–2. London: 1878.

† Napier's History of the War in the Peninsula, vol. iv. p. 116.

the centre: a device which would render scaling ladders useless. But ditches, however deep and broad, although they may prevent, as did those of the French fortresses in 1870, all attempts at surprise or a *coup de main*, will not prevent the ultimate reduction of a fortress, provided that the assailant is undisturbed. 'A siege,' says Sir John Jones, 'scientifically prosecuted, is beautifully certain in its 'progress and result.'* But a ditch will delay capture. Even if the escarp be breached, the counterscarp is difficult to destroy, except by mining; caponiers are comparatively secure; and, so long as the means exist of bringing a flanking fire to bear, the ditch is still a formidable obstacle. To compel the foe to resort to mining is a distinct gain for the besieged—a gain in time; and it cannot be too often repeated that, in fortress warfare, time is the first objective of the defence. Even shallow ditches have before now proved their value. We may instance the first attack on Les Perches redoubts at Belfort, January 26, 1871: 'The left 'column had five officers and two hundred and fifty un-'wounded men taken prisoners, as they were surrounded by 'a superior force in the ditches, from which they could not 'escape.' These ditches were but nine feet deep, but 'the 'commandant of the trenches, in expectation of an assault, 'had placed two battalions in reserve in rear of the forts, 'who, advancing at the right moment, repulsed the attack.' †

The sunken fence suggested by our author differs from the palisade in being constructed at a short distance from the work and under full fire of the parapet, in much the same position as that in which *abattis*, which, to all appearance, is absolutely impassable under fire, is usually placed. And yet, if we turn to history, do we find that *abattis* has always given the defenders absolute security? No obstacle was more common in the American Civil War, and yet the passage of great breadths was so often successfully accomplished that in the accounts of the operations so insignificant a circumstance that the assailants, before storming the work, were obliged to cross an intervening space covered with prostrate trunks, closely interlaced and with sharp-pointed branches, is, at most, but incidentally mentioned. It is true that in these assaults the assailants, as a rule, lost heavily; but their success proved that a fortified

* Journal of the Sieges in Spain. London: 1846. Vol. i. p. xv.
† Siege Operations in 1870–1. London: 1877. Pp. 183–5.

post is not proof, even when protected by a formidable obstacle, against the determined onslaught of far superior numbers. Moreover, fog, darkness, storm, want of vigilance, are all circumstances which favour the passage of obstacles.* We may be permitted to doubt, for instance, whether a sunk fence would have effectually impeded the rush of the stormers of Tel-el-Kebir. The rifles of the defenders, found sighted at eight hundred yards, would have done but little damage to troops unseen in the night, although struggling with material difficulties at a few score paces from the trenches. It is not difficult to conceive that even a better disciplined garrison, suddenly alarmed on a pitch-dark night, would have found it impossible to note the exact position of the enemy. The noise of his onset would have been drowned in the rattle of musketry and the crash of artillery, and, being invisible, he might have placed, at his leisure, bags stuffed with hay, such as were used by the British troops to facilitate their descent into the ditches of the Peninsula fortresses, to enable him to cross the fence. The truth is, that neither fire alone nor any field-obstacle which has yet been invented, nor both combined, make a work *sturmfrei*—at least no work which fulfils the purposes of permanent fortification as formulated above, a work to be held by relatively small, by an inferior, or by a demoralised garrison. The only efficient obstacle is a ditch so deep and broad that regular siege operations are necessary before passage can be attempted.

We cannot put aside the impression that Major Clarke has failed to distinguish between permanent fortifications and entrenched positions. In his laudable anxiety to promote economy, to teach the taxpayer that masses of masonry and concrete are often of no more value in war than banks of earth, constructed by the soldiery on the spot, he seems almost to have forgotten that in certain cases, to quote Mangin, 'the fundamental principle of the 'defence is that it should rest on the inert and indestructible 'masses of fortification, and not on more fragile elements;' † that there are cases in which it is above all necessary that the garrison of a fort should be absolutely secure from sur-

* Les Perches redoubts, although the ground in front was obstructed by wire entanglements, formed between the stumps of trees, were ultimately carried by surprise.

† Mémoire sur la Fortification Polygonale, par A. Mangin (Paris; 1851), p. 141.

prise or from any other species of attack than those which are signified by the terms siege or investment. Entrenchments such as he proposes may be perfectly adapted to all purposes of permanent fortification if they are held by a sufficient number of thoroughly good troops, with a system of organisation as complete as that of a field army. Otherwise, against a resolute enemy, they are likely to be of little value. 'Field redoubts left to their own garrisons,' says Sir John Jones in his account of Torres Vedras, 'even when thickly studded, can only be expected to 'impede, turn, or disorganise a column of march with its 'artillery, but never to oppose an impenetrable barrier to 'the advance of a powerful and determined army.'* Major Clarke may reply that his redoubts are not to be left to their own garrisons, that not they but the field army which they protect, and which employs them as pivots of manœuvre, is to oppose an impenetrable barrier to the enemy's advance.

But, in our opinion, the chief use of fortification is not to support the field army in actual battle, but to keep that field army at full strength by relieving it of the necessity of detaching large bodies of troops to guard important points. The field army is better away from the seductive but fatal allurements of a fortress. 'It should be remem-'bered,' says Clausewitz, 'that fortresses are only inns; they 'are no safe abiding places,' and it is when the field army is absent that fortification plays its most important *rôle*. Let us turn for a moment to the Franco-German war. Three fortresses, insignificant themselves, but from the height of their escarps or natural situation secure from surprise or escalade, stood near the frontier—Phalsbourg, Bitsche, and Thionville. Now, the Germans occupied the country in the neighbourhood during the second week in August. Bitsche was still French when the armistice was signed at Versailles on March 11. Phalsbourg did not surrender until December 12, Thionville on November 24. The garrisons of these three places did not exceed 8,000 men, and of these the majority were *gardes mobiles*. It is true that the Germans left but a small force to observe them, so that their resistance in no wise diminished the strength of the invader, but in barring important lines of communications and in compelling the advancing columns to make long *détours*, these fortresses did good service. And there were others that

* Memoranda relative to the Lines thrown up to cover Lisbon in 1810, p. 72. London: 1829.

were no less useful. It is significant that on August 15, immediately the German troops arrived on the Moselle, an attempt was made to capture Thionville by a *coup de main*. Moreover, according to Von Tiedemann, this attempt at surprise was not an isolated one; and it may be inferred, from this writer invariably prefacing his description of each French fortress by a remark to the effect that the strength of the profiles secured it from assault, that it was only the deep ditches and the revetted scarps that prevented the Germans from essaying attacks *de vive force*.

Another important point on which Major Clarke differs directly from almost all his colleagues, in our own as well as in Continental armies, is the necessity for enceintes.

'Two distinct *rôles*,' he says, 'have been claimed for enceintes (the rampart which surrounds a town within the circle of detached forts). In the first place they are supposed to prevent the rush of an enemy through the intervals in a line of forts and the capture of the interior of the position by a *coup de main*. In the second place they are to serve the purpose of an entrenchment, prolonging the defence after the main line has been reached and the fall of one or more of the detached forts. Military history and our own sense,' he asserts, 'support neither view. No army has ever yet penetrated between the intervals of a proper line of properly defended forts, or ever will. When, in 1860, the question of connecting Forts Tregantle and Scraesdon at Plymouth by a permanent line was raised, Sir J. Burgoyne was asked by Mr. Ferguson, "Do you not think there is a great danger of the enemy rushing between them and occupying the ground in rear?" The answer is significant, and well worth recalling: "It would be a very desperate undertaking, and what would they do when they got there?" Here, in a nutshell, is the contrast between the views of the soldier and the *théoricien*.'

Unfortunately a single remark of Sir John Burgoyne's, quoted without the context, will scarcely be considered sufficient evidence on which to condemn enceintes as useless. If no army has ever yet penetrated between the intervals of a line of forts, it is, in all probability, because an enceinte existed. Nor is Major Clarke fully borne out in his appeal to history.

'It has sometimes been gratuitously assumed,' he says, 'that the enceintes of Paris and Metz alone prevented the Germans in 1870 from passing the forts, notwithstanding that to have involved an army in street-fighting with a line of intact positions in rear would have been simply suicidal.'

It is an open secret, however, that one of the German generals, after the action of Châtillon on September 19,

telegraphed to headquarters, asking permission, as the French troops were evidently much disorganised, to push between the forts and reach the town. The answer was in the negative, the chief of the staff pointing out the dangers of assaulting a strong enceinte whilst the forts still held out in rear, and the following extract from Von Moltke's Memoirs, referring to this incident, is significant: 'It has 'been asserted that one of the forts might have been carried 'in the pursuit, and the duration of the investment have 'been thus cut short. But there was no need that the gates 'of the forts should have been opened to the fugitives, to 'whom Paris itself offered a refuge. It would have been 'impossible for our troops to escalade walls eighteen feet 'high without making special preparations.' As regards Metz, General Brialmont has referred to a statement of Captain Goetze, that after the artillery of the 1st German Army had bombarded Forts Queuleu and Des Bordes—still unfinished on August 17—the works were in such a condition that

'a *coup de main* against them made in sufficient force would in all probability have been successful. But,' he adds, 'it is doubtful if the works could have been maintained on the following days. The army of the Rhine, thrown back into Metz (by the victory of Gravelotte), would have been available for their recapture.' 'In effect,' says Brialmont, 'if the enceinte of Metz had not existed, the French army (after Gravelotte) would have been pushed beyond the forts and have probably been destroyed.' (*Brialmont.*) *

In the same chapter is quoted the opinion of General de Villenoisy.

'Those who were in Paris in 1870 have been struck with the service rendered by the enceinte. They agree in owning that but for its existence the Prussians would have found no difficulty in penetrating into the town. The forts themselves would not have been sufficient to stop them.'

As regards Belfort, which our author cites as an illustration of the uselessness of an enceinte, it is needless to speak. Every student of military history, on the appearance of the volume, at once detected the blunder he had fallen into. The enceinte of Belfort did not fall as a consequence of the capture of the detached outworks Les Perches redoubts, but was surrendered eight days later by direct order of the central Government at Paris. Belfort,

* Fortification du Temps présent.

then, by no means demonstrates the utter futility of an enceinte, and we are justified in considering the arguments of General Brialmont as far sounder than those brought forward by Major Clarke. We are at a loss to understand why the facts that a new town has been suffered to grow up outside the enceinte of Gosport, or that the inner of the two enceintes of Valetta is wholly valueless, are alluded to. They certainly do not prove that an enceinte, along a well-chosen line and with a clear field of fire to the front, is not amply sufficient to defeat all attempts at a *coup de main* or to interfere with the security of the inhabitants and the town. We may not believe that if the detached forts are taken and the field army defeated, the existence of an enceinte will postpone for more than a few days the surrender of the town, but Major Clarke opportunely recalls for us that the enceinte of Paris rendered possible 'the bitter 'and stubborn resistance' which the Commune offered to the army of Versailles. He is, moreover, of opinion, that

'when the chain of detached forts became essential, it was applied, in numerous cases, to encircle towns already possessing venerable enceintes, and the latter thus easily came to be regarded as an integral part of systems of defence. The chance,' he adds, 'of extending their realm was not to be lost, and to evolve from the turbid depths of their inner consciousness reasoning suitable to the matter was not difficult to the professors.'

Who those professors are Major Clarke does not tell us. What was the reasoning they have evolved from turbid depths he does not trouble to explain, but in opposition to the very temperate and well-argued case of the retention of enceintes put forward by Brialmont he asks us to content ourselves with statements not supported by history. 'Practically,' he writes, 'permanent enceintes are now an anachronism, 'and General Brialmont is almost alone in asserting their 'claim to be still regarded as a part of a system of fortifica-'tion.' In the face of this sweeping statement it is curious to read, in a work which serves as a text-book for the officers of the Royal Engineers—

'In some cases an enceinte is required in addition to the forts. . . . It may be of different degrees of strength, varying from a line of the most powerful construction, such as the enceinte of Antwerp, intended to resist all the efforts of a besieger to the very last, down to nothing. . . . Its existence will render it easier to hold the outer line, and will diminish the number of the garrison required to be pressed into a field force, since it will no longer be of any use for the enemy to attempt to push a body of men between the forts on the chance of taking the place

by a *coup de main*, as one or two forts must be captured in order to establish batteries against the enceinte. . . . If the garrison be small, it is especially desirable to have an enceinte.'*

Lastly, we may observe that since the war of 1870 new enceintes have been constructed round Strasburg and Cologne, that which surrounds Metz has been preserved, whilst those of the great fortresses of Mayence, Königsberg, Thorn, and Posen have been improved. Are the Germans also amongst the 'professors'?

General Brialmont comes in for severe castigation at the hands of his persistent critic because of his attitude towards the keep, or *réduit*. 'The historical evidence he has pro-'duced in favour of its retention by no means proves his 'case;' secondly, the type of *réduit* he suggests, 'a species 'of ant heap, containing casemate accommodation, maga-'zines, and stores,' condemns itself. With the last proposition we may feel disposed to agree, but Major Clarke's reading of history does not always carry complete conviction. But, without appealing to history, which, after all, has only a limited value, we may refer once more to the tactical principle of a second line; and one of the chief uses of a second line is that it may enable the defenders to hold on to the position until reinforcements arrive. However great may be our confidence in the superiority of the defensive, it would be injudicious to put aside the fact that, since the introduction of breech-loaders, strong posts have been carried by direct frontal attack, and it is by no means certain that magazine rifles or machine guns will compensate for the failure in nerve or the deficiency of *morale* which in the past made such an operation possible. Rapidity of fire has its dangers as well as its advantages. All we can say, therefore, of Brialmont's keep is that a sound tactical principle has been wrongly applied. We should have preferred an attack on the principle itself, and not a condemnation of a single method of applying the principle. How this second line, or *réduit*, is to be provided for permanent fortification or for field redoubts is certainly a question which is difficult to solve. In the fortifications of a place which is held by an inferior garrison it is of minor importance. A fort stormed by superior numbers can scarcely under such conditions be recovered. But in the entrenched position, which, according to Major Clarke, will represent the for-

* Permanent Fortification for English Engineers. By Major Lewis, R.E. 1890, p. 53.

tresses of the future, depending for their defence on men rather than on material, a *réduit* is essential, at least to the key points; or if not a *réduit*, some other device which will facilitate the counterstroke and render the permanent occupation of the work a very costly task.

Despite the opinion, quoted by Major Clarke, that 'the 'siege of Paris sufficed to kill the *réduit*,' we believe, on the contrary, that the defence of the line of investment against the French sorties demonstrated very fully the value of the *réduit*. Villages were prepared to serve as citadels; or, if a village formed part of the first line, then a church, a substantial building, or a group of buildings, was selected for the same purpose, and, more than once, proved of the greatest value. We may also recall the stubborn fighting, of several hours' duration, inside the parapets of Fort Fisher, January 16, 1865.

The two chapters in which our author first discusses the effect of the modern developement of firearms, of smokeless powder, and high explosives, and then deduces his very clear although scarcely conclusive exposition of the relative powers of attack and defence, and of the general requirements of modern fortification, are, to our mind, of far greater interest than those he has devoted to an historical review. We cannot, however, help feeling disappointed that he has looked upon the question from a limited point of vision. It is true that he is writing for Englishmen and English needs alone, and as regards fortification English needs are narrow. There are exceedingly few situations in the Empire where fortifications are absolutely requisite, and these are almost all of the same type. Ports, coaling stations, and dockyards are almost the only points at present to which the attention of the engineer is turned. With such situations Major Clarke has dealt exhaustively, and if, in the remote possibility of a Continental struggle, the leaders of our armies should have to take in hand a reproduction of the lines of Torres Vedras, or of Tchekmedjee, his 'fortress of the 'future' supplies, with certain modifications, a system suitable to such positions under the conditions of modern warfare. Nor has he forgotten that in the mountain passes beyond the Indus a more formidable foe may some day be met than the fierce clans of the Afridi or the Afghan. But on fortification in its relation to strategy he has scarcely touched, and it is because of this omission that we are disappointed. He repeats that tactical principles are the only sure guide for the engineer who has

to defend a place. We are equally certain that a sound knowledge of strategy is even more essential for any one who presumes to decide whether, in any given situation, fortification is necessary or not. And it is in this regard that we dissent from his dictum that fortification is an art that may be quickly mastered and easily understood. It may be granted that if it has once been admitted by competent authority, or even by the course of events, that such and such a locality needs artificial defences, and if he knows by what he will be opposed, any professional soldier familiar with the principles of attack and defence should be capable of devising an effective barrier. But fortification with reference to strategy demands extensive knowledge, not of history only, but of everything connected with war which lies outside the province of tactics.

In his tenth chapter Major Clarke gives us his idea of the fortress of the future. What this idea is he explains in a few words. 'The basis of the defence of a position 'should be redoubts designed for infantry and machine guns, 'supported by a powerful artillery kept outside them, and 'supplemented by a field force carrying on the outpost 'duties and manning field defences guarding the intervals.' Of this system of defence, be it remarked, the infantry redoubts are the only permanent portion. Supported by the field force, they would perhaps be sufficient; but our contention is, that there are many fortresses which would be without a field force. A field force performing the outpost duties, and manning the intervals between the redoubts, presupposes a large garrison, little inferior to the besieging army, and a garrison of such size is exactly what many fortresses would have to do without. In fact, for the very reason that no such garrison is available, permanent fortifications exist. Parapets and obstacles supply the place of men. It is here that we join issue with Major Clarke. His system is economical in everything but men; 'and men,' says Sir Howard Douglas, the famous engineer, 'are the 'most expensive means that can be used.'* Looking at the present needs of England and ignoring those of Continental nations, or of the needs of the empire that may arise when our frontier in Asia is conterminous with that of any European Power, when Canada asks how she is to preserve her territory, or when English officers find themselves in com-

* Observations on Carnot's 'Principles of Defence,' p. 181. London: 1819.

mand of a Kars or a Silistria, he asks us to pin our faith on what is practically no more than a single line of field defences, strengthened by permanent obstacles and possessing a powerful and mobile artillery. As he himself says, this is a 'defensive position.' It is not a fortress.

We can hardly believe that Major Clarke would expect a Strasburg, for instance, garrisoned by 17,500 troops of the same quality as the Gardes Mobiles and Francs-tireurs who surrendered to Von Werder, to hold out for forty-five days, were the only defences of the city the detached redoubts and the gun emplacements, on which he asks us to rely. In the first place, there is the danger of surprise. In the second place, if the place is of any size, the perimeter will be great, the line of defence consequently very extensive, and the numbers of redoubts, if placed at even an average interval of 2,500 yards, very considerable. A large garrison will be required for the redoubts alone. Thirdly, a line of this kind, despite the mobility of the artillery, possesses all the inherent inferiority of the defence. The defence of the intervals will depend upon the manœuvring ability of the general and capacity of the troops; and, in operations of manœuvre, the attack has the best of it, especially if the garrison is not large enough to attempt counter-attack. The assailant has the first move. 'The defendant can but 'follow suit, and he has to overcome the difficulty of dis-'tinguishing between false attacks and real ones.'

'Relating,' says Sir John Jones, 'to the lines of Torres Vedras, it may confidently be predicted that any commander not possessing the utmost promptitude, decision, and skill in manœuvring troops, who, trusting to that example, shall attempt to defend against a superior, or even equal force, a tract of four-and-twenty miles of country as a fortified position, will infallibly be beaten.' *

Fortunately for ourselves, the problems which present themselves in England are simple enough. London is the one assailable point within our boundaries, and Sir Edward Hamley, whose experience and knowledge are no more to be questioned than his ability, has clearly laid down in what manner the capital may be best secured from assault. The great lesson Englishmen have to learn from the study of fortification is that for the defence of such a position as the lines round London an active, well-trained, and well-officered army is absolutely essential. With such an army we have

* Memoranda relative to the Lines thrown up to cover Lisbon, p. 74.

no need whatever of any permanent inland fortifications beyond storehouses, magazines, and military roads.

Moreover, it is useless to shut our eyes to the fact that in every position provided with permanent defences the situation of the redoubts and batteries will be perfectly well known to the besiegers. With the maps that will most certainly be provided by the Intelligence Department there will be little more difficulty in ascertaining ranges beforehand or on the spot than is the case with the besieged. Captive balloons and even observatories will be common to both sides; and, lastly, we cannot see the force of Major Clarke's arguments that a mobile artillery 'will transfer to 'the defender some of the bewilderment which has hitherto 'been the prerogative of the defence,' or that 'the besieger 'will be unable to commence operations with any definite 'plan of action.' It is true that his redoubts will no longer offer the same facilities for bombardment as did the outworks or bastions armed with guns. But outworks and bastions were not the first objective of the attack in the sieges of past times. The first thing to be done was to crush the artillery of the defence. The assailant, therefore, will select a portion of the line for attack, and the first phase of a siege, as of a pitched battle, will be a duel between the two artilleries. If the besieger succeeds in driving that of the defender from the field, he will then proceed to the attack of the infantry positions, of the redoubts and field-defences; and, if superior in numbers, will be able to combine two or more attacks, or at least to divide the field force of the besieged by threats at different points.

We cannot help thinking that Major Clarke has minimised the rôle played by forts armed with heavy guns, and protected as far as possible from artillery fire. The value of such works consists in the fact that they can bring a flanking as well as a direct fire to bear, and that two forts can search out, with projectiles of sufficient weight to dismay the boldest infantry, the whole of the ground that lies within range. It is therefore impossible for the besieger to attack the intervals until he has reduced at least two of the forts, and has thus gained space whereon to act without interference from flanking or reverse fire. In fact, this flanking fire of itself defends the intervals, and permits the garrison to be reduced. Now the redoubts proposed by our author afford no facility for flanking fire; and in any

case, even were the profile improved, and traverses and parados added, it would be no difficult task to establish batteries of mortars or rifled howitzers opposite the works, which would prevent the garrisons from manning the parapets. It is true that with forts such as those built under obsolete conditions for the defence of Paris, flanking fire could not long be continued under a bombardment, and that, as actually happened during the siege, the works would be rendered untenable before many hours had elapsed; but the iron cupolas advocated by Brialmont, and the Grüson turrets which the German fortresses now possess, are proof against the heaviest siege ordnance. Moreover, the material of which modern forts are constructed is many times stronger than that of the Paris forts. We may add that the redoubts of both Kars and Petersburg were manned by artillery and mutually flanked.

History must be very closely examined before it is accepted as an infallible guide. It is of all things dangerous to believe that, because history has repeated itself some half-dozen times, it will still continue to do so. If this was the case, looking at the incidents of Torres Vedras, Sebastopol, Plevna, Petersburg, and the many others which have been industriously accumulated by Major Clarke, we might be content to believe that fortifications depending as it were on the inspiration of the moment are quite as efficacious as those designed in the piping times of peace. But it is a curious fact that history has repeated itself in regard to those extemporised defences in more respects than one. 'It may be demanded,' wrote General Lewis, R.E., in 1857, 'why go to the expense of construct-'ing fortresses, if mere walled towns or accidental positions 'can be proved to be places of equal value?' In reply it must be observed that you cannot thus calculate upon the resolution of the defenders, or their willingness to undergo the horrors of a siege, nor can you always depend upon an army wanting audacity and skill in the means of attack. . . . . He then speaks of 'those fortified places which have 'obtained a meretricious reputation from accidental cir-'cumstances,' and refers to 'the inadequacy of the means 'of attack (upon Sebastopol) in the first instance, and the 'impracticability of investing it.' 'If,' he repeats, 'a place 'has unexpectedly gained a reputation to which it was not 'entitled, it has arisen from accidental circumstances—from

'the want of the means of attack, or from the besiegers 'miscalculating the resources of the defence.'*

The sieges of the American war owed much of their duration to the same deficiencies on the side of the attack as were seen at Sebastopol and at Plevna. Moreover, a remark of Todleben's is most pertinent to the argument:—

'When the Crimean war terminated, many soldiers expressed the opinion that the example of the defence of Sebastopol was conclusive to show that it is useless in time of peace to spend vast sums in the construction of permanent fortifications. That opinion does not rest on a solid ground, for the defence of Sebastopol proves precisely the contrary. If Sebastopol had been fortified in time of peace, it is probable that the allies would never have conceived the idea of disembarking in time of war to besiege a strong place of such importance. The siege of Sebastopol comes again to verify once more the tactical opinion that men of war have never ceased to affirm that it is necessary always to protect the important strategic points in erecting, in time of peace, permanent works completely secure from a *coup de main*.'†

Not only as regards Sebastopol, but as regards the sieges of the American and Russo-Turkish wars, there is much danger of our being led to form conclusions by the brilliant results attained by improvised fortifications and hastily constructed earthworks. In the long Secession struggle rough and extemporised defences played an extraordinary part; but it may be questioned whether their *rôle* was not made conspicuous by the entire absence of the 'monumental 'structures' of permanent works. The defence of Petersburg was stubborn indeed, but it was scarcely remarkable except for the constant valour of the defenders. Lee, at the outset, was little inferior in numbers to his adversary, and in *morale* he was certainly the stronger. The fearful slaughter of the Wilderness Campaign had told with terrible effect on Grant's army. The places of the 60,000—just half his force—who had fallen in that month of battles had to be filled by raw recruits and green battalions. The loss in officers had been exceedingly heavy. Many of the bravest and most enterprising had perished in those fierce assaults on the log breastworks of the Virginian battle-fields.

But if Lee's works owed something of their inviolability to the deficiencies of the Federal troops, they had none the less all the inherent defects of temporary fortifications. The

* Professional Papers of the Corps of Royal Engineers, vol. vi. pp. 111–13.

† La Défense de Sébastopol, par le Général Todleben, p. 353.

line occupied was at last over thirty miles in length, extending day by day to meet the approaches which the Federals were making in order to cut the communications, and it is impossible not to notice the weakness of the detachments which Lee sent out to cover his vital point. But he could do no more. He was bound to maintain a strong front all along his line. There was not a single section which he could trust, even for a few days, to the guardianship of a few men. Bazaine was able, at Noisseville, to carry nearly his whole army to the east side of Metz, leaving the west side to the protection of the forts. Lee, on the contrary, hampered by a long array of field works, none of them *sturmfrei*, was compelled to keep the main force of his army in their lines. He could use but a small portion on the distant flank. Had he been faced by an army as efficient and as resolute as his own, it is doubtful whether he could have denuded his parapets of a single man. In the earlier stages of the siege he was able to mass 10,000 men for the defence of the Weldon railroad; as his army grew weaker and that of his adversary increased in strength and in *morale*, he could send at the end of March no more than 3,600 infantry to meet the far more serious movement against the south side railroad. In fact, Petersburg demonstrates the weakness rather than the strength of field works. The massive lines of entrenchments behind which Johnston's army delayed Sherman's march on Atalanta demonstrate nothing to the purpose. In every instance they were turned. Vicksburg perhaps proves the efficacy of earthen parapets when defended by an army little inferior to that of the besieger; but here, as at Petersburg and at Plevna, the defender was tied to his line of works. He could not mass in sufficient force for an effective counter-stroke.

The American war, then, bears testimony to the value of hasty entrenchments on the battle-field, but hardly encourages us to rate works which are not *sturmfrei* as the adequate defence of a fortress. Too much stress has, we think, been laid on the impregnability of a fortified position, and General Wright's statement that a parapet defended by a double rank of infantry is proof against the assault of five times their number has been too exclusively quoted. It has been forgotten that even in the American war successful assaults of strong entrenchments were by no means infrequent. For instance, at the siege of Petersburg, on June 16, four redans and their connecting lines were carried by Hancock's corps;

at dawn of day on the 17th Potter stormed the redans and lines on the Shand House ridge, capturing four guns and 600 prisoners; and a second line was carried in the afternoon. On September 29 Fort Harrison, armed with sixteen guns, was carried by Stannard's division, and the 'enemy was next driven from the entrenchments right and 'left of the fort, including two lunettes, with their artillery 'and six guns.' On the same day the entrenchments and redoubts near Peebles Farm were carried by Griffin and Ayres. On March 25 Gordon's Confederate division carried Fort Steadman, a work protected by abattis and fraises, in a night attack, and with it three strong artillery emplacements. On April 1 the final assault on the Confederate lines was undertaken. The points attacked were held by 11,600 men. Three army corps, numbering probably about 40,000 men, were detailed for the assault. The movement was completely successful, and the next morning a line of redoubts was stormed by Humphreys. On the same day two strong forts, Gregg and Whitworth, were carried by a division of Gibbon's corps.*

The same was true in 1877:—

'At the very beginning of the war the Shipka works fell after a comparatively feeble defence, and towards the end Skobeleff stormed the entrenched camp at the foot of the pass even without a previous bombardment. In Asia positions were captured by assault continually. Kars fell to a night attack, and if Plevna resisted long enough on account of its formidable situation and gallant defence, the works on the Sofia road were captured by Gourko. Gorni-Dubnik had four redoubts armed with guns; they were carried by assault'†

The Grivitza redoubt fell to the Roumanians, and Skobeleff carried trenches and redoubts on the Green Hills. It is true that in the majority of these instances the assailants lost far more heavily than the besieged, and they certainly prove that, except by surprise or when held by a demoralised garrison, strong works cannot be taken except at a great cost of life.

But our point is that such works were not impregnable in 1861–5 or 1877, and the onus of proving that improvements in firearms and explosives have added so much strength to the defence as to make them inviolable, lies on those who advise us to substitute them for fortifications of a more

---

* The Virginia Campaign, by General Humphreys, p. 286.

† Field Works, by Colonel C. B. Brackenbury, p. 125. London, 1885.

powerful type. The magazine rifle and smokeless powder are both considered to favour the defence, but until this has been proved by actual experience it would be unwise to lessen our precautions because of any fancied superiority thus afforded. We may bear in mind that the proposition is by no means universally accepted. In theory it is sound, but in practice doubtful. It is stated that

'the magazine rifle possesses an effective range of about 2,000 yards, a maximum range of about 3,200 yards, and a continuous speed of fire averaging at least fifteen aimed rounds per minute. An assaulting force, when in movement, cannot deliver an effective fire. The effective range of the infantry weapon has been multiplied by about twenty, and its rate of fire by at least fifteen; an immense power has been conferred for the defence, which no artillery power has neutralised.'

Now, in the first place, we find a very different idea obtaining as to the effective range of infantry fire. 'At '1,700 yards for the infantry of the army's position unaimed 'rifle fire begins to tell; at 800 yards aimed rifle fire 'becomes very effective.'* Again, 'at long distances '(i.e. from 1,700 to 800 yards) the vulnerability (of troops 'with an extended front) is not great.' Moreover, as Lord Wolseley says, 'taking a mass of men—because an army is 'a great mass of average men—I believe out of every 1,000 'soldiers in any army you will find that 10 per cent. cannot 'well see 1,000 yards, much less hit an object at that dis-'tance.'† And the author of 'Fire Tactics' thus sums up the position: 'The results of experiments certainly do not 'show a sufficiently useful percentage to justify the use of 'long-range fire (i.e. any fire at over 800 yards) against a 'line of standing men at over 1,000 yards.'

It will take something more than a mere statement to make us believe that the effective range of rifle fire has suddenly increased from between 1,200–800 to 2,000 yards; and, at the same time, if the assaulting force, when in movement, cannot deliver an effective fire, it also transforms itself into a target very difficult to hit. Nor is this all. The whole of the assaulting force is not necessarily in movement. Part may remain behind in selected positions to cover by their fire the advance of their comrades; and, despite Major Clarke's assertion to the contrary, we hold that the introduction of rifled howitzers, favoured by smokeless powder,

* Infantry Fire Tactics, by Captain C. B. Mayne, R.E., pp. 206, 254. London, 1884.

† Ibid. p. 257.

will in some measure neutralise the power of the rifle, and postpone 'the stage at which the advance has to be made 'without any support from artillery fire' to within a very short distance of the defenders' works. Lastly, to refer to a point unimportant in itself, but which, as it affects the accuracy of a would-be teacher of the people, and therefore the value of the whole of his argument, we would remark that in 1844 it was ascertained, by experiment, that the firelock of that day could be discharged seven times per minute, and even the musketeers of Frederick the Great were able to fire five rounds within the same space of time.

Even in the days of Brown Bess entrenched positions were little less difficult to storm than they are now; and we believe, if historical statistics go for anything, that the losses of the assailant were just as great during such an operation as they were at Plevna or St. Privat. If it be said that the awful losses of Grant's army in the Wilderness campaign were inflicted by rifles, the redoubts of Borodino were defended by men armed with flintlocks; and it may be remembered that it cost Marlborough 8 general officers, 1,500 men killed, and 4,000 wounded, to force the imperfectly and hastily entrenched lines of a small corps of French at Donauwerth, in June 1704. And after all this slaughter—quite as excessive as that of the Prussian Guard at St. Privat—the victory was not complete. We may be permitted to doubt whether the balance between attack and defence has shifted so much as Major Clarke would have us believe. In the latest European wars the proper tactics for the breechloader were not understood, except perhaps by Skobeleff, and we have yet to see what their effect will be on the field of battle. Again, we have yet to see the practical effect of powerful explosives, such as mélinite, roburite, and the rest. It is an open secret that the French engineers believe that earthworks, however massive, will be completely destroyed after a few hours' bombardment. It is certainly too early to deprive the defensive of the strength which is afforded it by permanent fortifications of the strongest type.*

---

* We cannot but regret that the question of powerful explosives has been so curtly dismissed. 'The experience gained at Lydd' is scarcely conclusive proof that 'no increase of results against earthworks can be thus obtained.' How comes it that the Germans, since the introduction of mélinite, have thought fit to reconstruct the whole of their frontier fortifications?

We have now stated our main objections to Major Clarke's proposals. We have forborne to summon history to our aid at every step because, as we have said, history is a dangerous witness. Of this last fact no one is better aware than Major Clarke. The first paragraph of his introductory chapter is one of the most taking of the whole book. 'The test of 'practical experience,' he writes, 'as applied to fortifications 'is uniformly ambiguous. The data are never scientifically 'complete, and each successful or unsuccessful attack or 'defence may generally be traced to any one of a dozen 'causes in accordance with the personal predilections of the 'writer.' He then, in a most original and vivacious passage, illustrates his meaning by epigrammatic allusions to the sieges of modern times, and shows how easily history may be distorted to support preconceived theories. But, curiously enough, with the danger clear before him, he then undertakes an analysis of past history as regards fortification, and on this basis endeavours to forecast the changes in practice which appear to be justified by the altered conditions of war. 'The task,' he writes, 'has been undertaken with a 'full realisation of the difficulties and temptations pointed 'out;' and yet he has fallen into the snare he so clearly sees. He has employed history, and sometimes misconceived it, in order to support a theory. His argument is this: that extemporised defences have given in the past as good, if not better, results than permanent works; and his conclusion that, with the improved firearms of the day, permanent works of the type advanced by many engineers are of no more value than inexpensive earthworks.

In the first place we may notice that in his list of sieges, with the exception of Turin, Toulon, Badajoz, and Burgos, he mentions no permanent fortress which withstood every endeavour of the besiegers. On the other hand, he is careful to catalogue the number of times that extemporised defences have made creditable resistance; but, at the same time, he omits to notice those which made no defence at all. His average, then, of the relative duration of the sieges sustained by permanent and improvised fortifications can scarcely be considered as a convincing argument. Nor has he been quite fair in his comparison of results. He himself speaks of the small influence of fortifications compared with the spirit with which a defence is conducted, and no one could be found to deny that the *morale* of the defenders, as well as the proportion of their strength in men, guns, and resources to that of the besiegers, is a most important factor

in the question of resistance. Yet it is this very factor which he ignores. 'Defences,' he says again, 'were short 'or long, contemptible or brilliant, in accordance with the 'spirit of the troops, the genius and resource of their 'commanders, the available supply of food and ammuni-'tion, and not because the fortress was laid on simple or 'complex lines.' This assertion is scarcely a proof that, *cæteris paribus*, permanent fortifications cannot hold out for a far longer period than improvised works. To compare the relative power of resistance of the two types of fortification by the average length of siege that either underwent is as fallacious a test of the actual strength as to compare the relative rate of speed of two Derby winners by the time they took to complete the Epsom course. There are too many circumstances to be taken into consideration, any one of which may have been the real cause of the result produced. Major Clarke's proposals for the defence of a fortified position are possibly sufficient; for the defence of a fortress, we believe that we have shown that they are distinctly inadequate. Referring to his interesting summary of the sieges of 1870–1, we find that the antiquated French fortresses, garrisoned by ill-disciplined and badly trained Gardes Mobiles, disturbed in more than one case by interior dissensions, and without any system of previously organised defence, did exceedingly good service. Would mere earthworks, unsupported by a permanent *enceinte* and masonry forts, have given the ill-disciplined and badly trained garrisons the moral strength they derived from their *sturmfrei* parapets? Belfort would seem to answer in the affirmative. But, says Von Tiedemann—

'there were not only very strong, but very well placed detached forts, which kept the besiegers at a distance; but there were extremely few places from whence a successful artillery attack could be carried out. The season and the nature of the ground was also peculiarly unfavourable to the attack. In addition to this was the military capability of the energetic commandant, and to him must be given the credit of having by military training and discipline turned the heterogeneous garrison into opponents worthy of our respect.' *

Again, when the siege commenced the besiegers had only 8,000 men, half the strength of the besieged, and the vicinity of Bourbaki's army of relief postponed the real opening of the formal attack until January 21. Moreover, the attack on Les Perches was rendered difficult by the fire

* The Siege Operations in the Campaign against France, p. 176.

from the Castle and Forts La Justice and La Miolte, all three permanent works with bomb-proof cover, as well as by the rocky ground.

Major Clarke has devoted a chapter to an examination of the most recent proposals of Continental engineers, and, although he criticises very sharply certain particulars contained in these suggestions of his contemporaries, his chief objection to them appears to be that they disclose the fact 'that there is no present chance of anything approaching to 'a consensus of opinion as to the fortifications of the future.' 'Fortification,' he remarks more than once, 'is no exact 'science,' and we are of opinion that this ruling has a more extended application than he is disposed to admit. He is the author, or rather the advocate, of a system which he appears to believe is suited to all situations. In accurate shooting, careful organisation, and mobile artillery, he tells us, we shall find salvation. There are situations, however, which demand more from material and less from men. If Major Clarke can show us that a place protected on the lines he lays is equally free from the chances of surprise and escalade, so far as can be, and equally proof against bombardment, equally strong against direct attack, and capable, all things being equal—garrison, resources, and the like—of making as protracted a defence as a place fortified on the principles advocated by Brialmont and the rest, by all means let us have nothing but earthen redoubts and mobile batteries. But Major Clarke himself implies that a parapet, although protected by field-obstacles, requires steady troops for its defence before it can be pronounced *sturmfrei*, and it is no new discovery that inferior troops are far more liable to surprise than those who are well disciplined. Outpost duties are simple in theory, but of extreme difficulty in practice. Moreover, for heavy artillery to be mobile, well-trained gunners and artificers are no less necessary than perfect organisation; and, lastly, until the history of fresh sieges has been written we may be permitted to doubt whether the detached forts of Brialmont, in the construction of which iron, beton, and earth may be employed, are not far more defensible, and require a far smaller garrison, than the redoubts and batteries proposed by Major Clarke. As fortification is no exact science, it cannot be reduced within narrow limits, or confined to a few rules. As the ground to be occupied is of as infinite variety as strategical necessities, so there must be an infinite variety of the methods in which fortification is to be applied. These methods must be based on

tactical principles, on human nature, and on the needs of the situation. One type is insufficient for the engineer, and to bind him down to a single system would be but to encourage the errors of those who applied the bastion trace of Vauban to the warfare of the desert. With a deep knowledge of war an extensive acquaintance with every material means of defence must go hand in hand.

At the same time, should occasion arise, in Major Clarke's pages will be found a detailed list of every single accessory useful to the defence of a position such as Plevna. We would commend his tenth chapter to the notice of every soldier. It is true that many of his suggestions have been anticipated in text-books. They are familiar to all readers of engineering literature. But there is a vast difference between the bald and unsuggestive statements of the official manuals and the concise, vivacious, and impressive sentences in which Major Clarke has laid down the latest ideas on the requirements of a fortified position. The general principles he has sought to establish are, broadly speaking, sound. Of tacticians some will quarrel with details, others will declare that he has as systematically exaggerated the strength of the defensive as he has depreciated that of the attack; but none will dispute his ability as a teacher, or accuse him of undue deference to theory. His realisation of the value of mobile artillery, of quick-firing guns, of good lateral communications, and of the concealment of all defensive works, strongly and skilfully expressed, is in itself sufficient proof that he is as practical as broad-minded. In the arrangement of his subject, in the method in which his conclusions are led up to, and in the literary skill which has crystallised in so attractive a manner the teachings of his school, he surpasses any other military writer of whom we have knowledge. We may regret his excessive zeal for economy; economy, however catching a cry, is full of risks when applied to military affairs; but we admire the clearness with which he has enunciated the principles which, in his opinion, are to rule land fortification in the future, and the energy with which he has attacked that vagueness of thought which so greatly hampered the fortification of the past. It is in this last respect that he has been most successful, and it is for these reasons that the book before us is an exceedingly valuable contribution to military literature. The mists which have hitherto obscured the science of the engineer have been cleared away. The importance of recent changes and developements in the art and *matériel*

of war is at last before us, impressively stated if not convincingly demonstrated. It is useless to deny that it has not hitherto been fully recognised. In a trenchant passage, which can scarcely fail to strike home, attention is directed to the elementary instruction of the British officer, and, whilst it clearly shows that a revolution in the teaching of the science of fortification is demanded, it proves indirectly that there has been no revolution in thought corresponding to the progress of the century.

'In a course of study in steam-engineering, a reverential allusion to "Puffing Billy" and the "Rocket" is a natural concession to the claims of history; but it suffices. The student is not called upon to learn the fortuitous dimensions of these elementary machines, nor expected to draw them from memory. They are not put before him as ideals, but as mere links in the chain of scientific evolution. Instruction in fortification—ironically so called—sometimes proceeds on opposite lines. The cadet is brought up to regard the so-called modern French and polygonal systems as the basis of fortification, the ideals to which the science must conform as nearly as possible under the altered conditions of war. He ought to be strictly forbidden to waste his time in learning useless forms, proportions, and dimensions. He actually finds a whole examination paper monopolised by them. As a result his conception of fortification is vitiated at the outset, and bastioned fronts, *mâchicoulis*, &c., arise by the banks of the Nile. Teaching must be based on tactical principles alone, and the cadet must be taught to regard the masterpieces of Vauban as mere special applications—believed to be satisfactory in their day—of those principles. When this is done there will be every hope of sound progress, and of reaching a fair general consensus of matured opinion.'

If land fortification suffers from vagueness of thought and a want of definition, coast defence has almost reached the status of an exact science. Since the Royal Commission of 1859–60 recommended that enormous sums should be spent on the defences of Portsmouth, Plymouth, the Thames and the Medway, on the plea that the country would never stand the expense of maintaining a Channel fleet sufficiently powerful to cover those ports, an extraordinary change has taken place in the attitude of the country towards the navy. Without underrating in any degree the efforts of those sailors who, since the publication of Sir John Colomb's pamphlet on 'The Protection of our Commerce,' in 1867, have been constant in their endeavour to enlighten the public as to the true principles of naval warfare, we believe that the practical lessons of the naval manœuvres, and the criticism they elicited, have done more than aught else to produce a clearer appreciation of the interests involved. For the

first time the judgement of experts in naval matters has been officially made public, and warnings, which would have passed unheeded if made through the mouthpiece of the First Lord of the Admiralty or through the medium of the press, have fallen on attentive ears. It has at last been made clear that imperial defence is so closely connected with the supremacy of the seas that with the maintenance of that supremacy it stands or falls. It has at the same time been recognised that naval men are our best counsellors as to how that supremacy is to be maintained; and whilst the taxpayers have cheerfully submitted to those demands which the admirals have considered necessary, military engineers are content to accept the teaching of the navy with regard to the principles to be observed in the defence of our coasts and coaling stations.

'To an empire constituted as is our own naval supremacy is the first condition of existence, and if this condition is not fulfilled coast defences are practically useless. They may postpone for a brief period, they cannot avert, the final catastrophe. The whole teaching of war clearly proves that serious naval operations against an enemy's coast—blockades, the movement of expeditionary forces across wide tracts of sea, the deliberate attack of fortified ports—are practicable only to the Power which holds and can retain the command of the sea.'

So long, therefore, as our battle ships are superior in number and in strength to those of any other Power or combination of Powers, there is no fear of any serious attempt to destroy port, arsenal, or dockyard. But there are two possibilities which must be faced—the first, that although the general supremacy of the seas may be assured to our flag, superiority cannot be maintained in every single quarter of the globe, and that, for a time, whilst the war ships are absent, ports and coaling stations may be exposed to sudden attack; secondly, at the outset of a war, before a shot had been fired, it is within the borders of possibility that an 'Alabama' might attempt to harry one of our distant coaling stations or to bombard a dockyard. Such an operation, if successfully carried out, would probably have more influence on the issue of the conflict than a raid upon our merchantmen. Still, coast defence, so far as England is concerned, is a far less complicated question than that of land fortifications. But it is a question which affects the colonies as much as it does ourselves. Every single dependency of the Crown, every spot of earth where the Union Jack flies, relies as much for its security on the efficiency of the navy as does London itself. In

view, therefore, of the huge interests involved, and of the fact that England is more likely to have to do with the attack than with the defence of ports and arsenals, we cannot blame Major Clarke for looking at the question from an English point of view. It is scarcely necessary to make suggestions to others that they might use against ourselves.

Moreover, for the defence of places against a purely naval attack in contradistinction to the attack of naval and land forces combined, the principles he lays down, in our opinion, are absolutely sufficient.

'The science of coast fortification may, perhaps, be defined as that of distributing and mounting guns of various natures to the best advantage, in securing which a compromise has to be effected between two somewhat antagonistic conditions. First, the offensive power of the gun should have its fullest scope; 2nd, the protection given to the gun and detachment should be the maximum, compatible with the first condition and with economy.'

Having enunciated the proposition that artillery is the principal factor in the battle of forts and fleets, he adds that

'future coast defences will take the form of displaced batteries or emplacements, either provided with comparatively slight gorge defence (as security against landing parties) or protected by a fixed or provisional redoubt commanding their displaced emplacements.'

But perhaps the greatest strength of the defence is the disappearing method of mounting guns. For reasons which we have not space to notice, but which will commend themselves to every practical soldier, Major Clarke reduces methods of mounting to a simple alternative—the barbette or the disappearing principle. 'The former has the advan-'tage of economy and of requiring less skill for its efficient 'maintenance. The protection of the gun detachment is 'considerable, although the gun is always exposed to be 'dismounted or injured by a direct hit; the target prof-'fered is very small, and can be made almost indistin-'guishable at moderate range.' Quick-firing guns of great penetrative power—the Zalinski pneumatic gun, firing a projectile containing 600 lbs. of blasting gelatine with a maximum range of 2,000 yards, and shells of smaller size with remarkable accuracy up to 5,000—are well adapted for coast defence. The great value of the former is its power of searching out and rendering the unarmoured portions of a vessel untenable, of acting against the guns and gear in

barbette towers, of destroying bullet-proof protection, and generally of increasing the average rate of fire, which would otherwise be slow. These guns are being provided in large numbers on board all ships of war; but between ordnance fixed on a floating platform, with protection very inferior to that of a strong and an almost undistinguishable earthwork, and pieces which can be laid at leisure on a target which consists of the whole unarmoured portion of the ship, the contest is hopelessly unequal. The invention of Captain Zalinski, Major Clarke believes, will supersede the dirigible torpedo as a means of coast defence, and in some cases replace submarine mines with advantage. Nor do these appliances complete the armoury of the coast engineer. The last half of the century has not only brought forth in rapid succession destructive machines of extraordinary energy, but it has at the same time provided the means of using those machines with accuracy and precision under all conditions of atmosphere. The electric light is a valuable adjunct to the mine-field. Night enterprises are made more difficult; the dangers of surprise are much reduced; and, although the evidence of experiments is wanting, we cannot but agree with Major Clarke that 'it 'is probable that good artillery practice can be made by coast 'batteries employing the light in connexion with the position-'finding system, or even with a depression range-finder.' Lastly, it is the system just alluded to which enables the defender to use his deadly appliances with such terrible effect. Untried yet in actual warfare—for the mechanism remains a secret—it has, nevertheless, been so thoroughly tested, and has given results so entirely satisfactory, that the accuracy of fire is greatly increased: high-angle fire, even against a ship in motion, from shore guns completely hidden from view and fire, is rendered possible, whilst the entire armament of a fortress can be controlled by one central authority, and the whole of the fire inspired by a definite purpose. 'The position-finding system is, and must always 'be, inapplicable on board ship. . . . Major Watkins' 'invention is thus a distinct and unbalanced gain to the 'defence.'

But if land defences are now far superior in strength to the forts armed with smooth-bores commanding channels blocked by booms or sunken ships, which represented the coast protection of the era which preceded the American war, the armoured battle-ships of to-day are equally superior to the three-deckers. In 1859 the largest projectile carried by a

vessel of war weighed no more than 68 lbs., powerless to pierce more than 5 inches of armour at short range. In 1891 the shells of the 110-gun weigh 1,800 lbs., penetrating 35 inches of iron at 1,000 yards, pulverising granite like sandstone, and breaking up huge masses of concrete as they would the walls of a mediæval castle. In place of the oaken walls 18 inches of armour protects the guns, and a belt of little less strength covers the vital portion of the ship. Instead of the uneasy platform of the great three-decker, rolling to every motion of the waves, there is a platform steadied by the enormous weight of metal; and, thanks to steam, not only the speed but the manœuvring properties of the ships have improved almost in the same ratio as the guns. Vessels of 10,000 tons are under the guidance of a small hand-wheel, which can be manipulated with perfect ease, and by means of which the helm can be put hard over in ten or twelve seconds. Nor can we omit the 100 to 400 tons of auxiliary armament—in addition to the heavy guns—that go to make up the offensive power of the battle ship. It would seem, then, to the uninitiated that vessels armed with destructive engines of such magnitude, and of such high manœuvring capacity, would have little difficulty in disposing of the strongest of modern fortresses. But the contrary is the case. The old three-decker with her tiers of guns and her comparative immunity from vital injury, was, in fact, a far more formidable opponent of coast defences than the modern battle ship. The volume of projectiles her broadsides could deliver within a given time was far greater than could be delivered by the 'Nile' or 'Benbow.' And for all practical purposes a 6-inch shell will effect as much damage in a gun emplacement as a 16-inch. Moreover, a shell fired from a rifled gun is more destructive between the decks of an ironclad than was a round shot tearing a hole through either side of a wooden vessel; and, be it remembered, the finest battle ship that floats has no pretensions to be invulnerable. Even in former days, when ships and forts fought on far more equal terms, after the successful bombardment of Acre in 1840, the Duke of Wellington earnestly warned the House of Lords that the fleet was not intended, and should not be asked, to attack a fortress. The failure of the navy to force a way into Sebastopol was due only to the inherent superiority of land defences; the Secession war, extraordinary as were the successes of the Federal admirals, proves as clearly as history can that, whilst to steam past a well-defended earthwork is practicable, to

cause its evacuation is impossible without the assistance of a landing party. Alexandria is a remarkable instance of the difference between theory and practice, and justifies the opinion of the American naval officers present that 'vessels 'are not yet, and never will be, able to fight on even terms 'with forts.'* To learn of what material these forts should be constructed, where they should be placed, how they should be armed, and all the thousand details relative to their defence, we need go no further than the present volume. It is impossible to praise too highly the chapters which Major Clarke has devoted to the question of forts *versus* battle ships. He has placed in juxtaposition the powers of the attack and the defence, and, whilst awarding their full value to each, has avoided that tendency to exaggeration and undue depreciation which disfigures his earlier pages. History is fairly treated. His personal observations of the effects of the bombardment of Alexandria are of the utmost value, and his clear perception of the true principles of naval strategy leads us to suspect that the subject of coast defence has engrossed his attention to a greater degree than that of land fortification. Whilst, therefore, we cannot accept his conclusions as to the permanent fortification of the future, we may now congratulate the English army on the possession of an excellent text-book on field defences, and we would ask all those interested in the question of Imperial defence to study closely Major Clarke's masterly exposition of the relative strength of forts and fleets.

* Report on the Operations in Egypt. 'Information from Abroad, War Series, No. III. p. 74.

ART. VI.—*Une Année de ma Vie*, 1848-9. Par le Comte DE HÜBNER, ancien Ambassadeur d'Autriche à Paris et à Rome. 8vo. Paris: 1891.

THIS is a truly delightful book: delightful by reason not only of the interest which attaches to the personal narrative of a statesman who played an important part during a most eventful year, but also of the quaint light-heartedness of the style, and still more of the admirable pictures of the great men with whom the author was intimately associated. Radetzky, Schwarzenberg, Windischgrätz, and others, whose names forty years ago filled the voice of fame, are here portrayed as they then appeared to one who knew them well, and whose business it was to weigh and appreciate their merits. The events of the year are mentioned or alluded to rather than described, for the story, as the title indicates, is almost entirely personal. A diplomatist's work does not lie in the turmoil of war or revolt, but in the allaying of that turmoil; and his preparation for the more serious business necessarily takes the form of a careful examination of the points at issue. This examination is here often detailed at some length; the importance and the probable consequences of passing events are discussed on such information as was possible, so that the discussions as now related are to a great extent speculative, for, as the author expressly tells us,

'The pages of this book are not *Mémoires*. They do not relate the events of forty years ago from confused recollections, or by the aid of casual notes made at the time. They are the reproduction, often word for word, of a journal regularly kept, and, as far as possible, written up each morning; though to render the meaning clearer, by refreshing the reader's memory, I have, whenever it seemed advisable, inserted short accounts of the events referred to.'

In February 1848 Baron Hübner was residing in Leipzig as the Austrian consul-general in Saxony, when he was suddenly recalled to Vienna, to be sent on a few days later to Milan. It was a time of ferment and uneasiness. In view of an impending crisis, and to ensure a uniform line of action, a committee had been established there, consisting of the Viceroy, Marshal Radetzky, the commander-in-chief, and Count Spaur, the governor. To these had been added Count Ficquelmont as diplomatic agent, and to conduct the correspondence of the committee with the several Italian governments. Ficquelmont had now been appointed

Minister for Foreign Affairs, and Baron Hübner was sent as his successor. He arrived at Milan on March 5, and dined with Ficquelmont the same evening. The revolution in Paris was then a week old, and it seemed almost certain that the swell of the storm would reach into Italy. The optimism of the government was absurd. Ficquelmont considered it a huge joke. 'They have required of me what 'is impossible,' he said. 'All that I have done and that 'you can do here has been, and will be, but so many sword-'cuts in the water,' and he burst out laughing, impressing on the younger diplomatist rather the desire to weep. 'Although he carries on his broad shoulders the head of 'Socrates,' he wrote in his journal, 'he is the laughing 'philosopher.'

But Ficquelmont was hardened both by experience and by years; he was at this time more than 70. It is, indeed, not a little curious to note the very large proportion of old men who at this most critical period were at the head of Austrian affairs, not in Italy only, but in Vienna. Metternich and his successor, Wessenberg, were both 75; Radetzky was 82; Count Wallmoden, his chief of the staff, was 79; and many others in high positions were well over the allotted three-score and ten. Some of them were, no doubt, exceptional men, and bore their years lightly; but it is impossible to suppose that they all were so, or to avoid the suggestion that the misfortunes of Austria were—in part at least—due to the want of energy or fire in her administrators. Hale old men may frequently be excellent diplomatists or counsellors, but, as a rule, the march of years dulls their quickness of perception and of decision. Radetzky is spoken of as an exception, and his conduct of the Italian campaign has always been commended; but it is difficult to believe that it would not have been more incisive if the weight of the last score of years had been removed. Wallmoden was himself uneasily conscious of his failing powers, and had shortly before this applied to be retired. Now that war with Piedmont seemed imminent, he regretted the step that he had taken, and begged Hübner to write to Metternich in his favour. 'Tell him,' he said, 'that you have found me in 'good condition; although, to say the truth,' he added, 'I 'have not all the freshness of a man of sixty.' Between him and his octogenarian chief there was a little playful rivalry, as is not unusual. At a grand military dinner given by Radetzky, at which all the senior officers of the army were present, Hübner happened to be the only civilian.

'The marshal,' he says, 'placed me beside him, and with old-fashioned politeness, and hands which were a little shaky, put some delicate morsels on my plate. Count Wallmoden, who sat on my right, whispered to me, "Notice how shaky he is; he is getting old." After which he dropped off to sleep. It was now the marshal's turn: "Look there," he said, with a wink; "il fait encore le galant près du beau sexe, et il ronfle en plein dîner."'

This dinner was on March 13. After having passed the morning in receiving the civil functionaries, Baron Hübner had gone to it in very low spirits, but the genial atmosphere of the room revived him.

'The sight of old father Radetzky, surrounded by his paladins,' he says, 'made me see men and things in brighter colours. What struck me also was the simplicity, I might almost say the modesty of their language, and the justice (if I am not mistaken) of their remarks on the precarious position in which we are. They are not mere soldiers, impatient to put the rebellious subjects of their emperor to the edge of the sword; but they understand that the time for half measures is past, and that it is impossible to reconcile the irreconcileables. These wish to dispossess Austria of a province which she has held for three centuries. To attain this end the national party has allied itself with the secret societies, and with their assistance has enveloped the country in a network of conspiracy. The Italian *employés* of the government have almost all been gained over to the national cause; and the Germans, thinking themselves abandoned by their superiors, have lost all heart and do nothing. In the official world the disorganisation is complete. At Vienna they seem to have forgotten that such a place as Lombardy exists. There is nothing to trust to but the army. Such is the language of the dinner-table: it is but the echo of what the marshal, with less freedom, had already said to me, and shows that not only in his military capacity, but morally and politically, it is Radetzky who inspires and dominates the splendid little army which, perhaps within a few days, he will be called to lead against the enemy.'

Baron Hübner's discussion of the causes of that enmity towards Austria, which unquestionably existed in the cities of Lombardy in 1848, is extremely interesting; and if the conclusion arrived at differs considerably from that generally adopted in England, and runs counter to English prejudices, it must be admitted that few if any Englishmen have had equal opportunities of studying the question, or have had such powerful motives for doing so. He had been at Milan in 1828, and though then too young to trouble his head about politics, he knows that the Milanese and the Germans met on friendly terms. He was there again in 1838 at the coronation of the Emperor Ferdinand as king of Lombardy

and Venice; there had been an amnesty for political offences, and no one seemed to entertain rancour.

'Milan was *en fête*, and the salon of Prince Metternich, who accompanied the court, was the rendezvous of the Lombard aristocracy, and Prince Belgioioso, who had returned from exile, might be heard there singing alongside of Pasta, with Rossini at the piano. He was a tenor of the first class. "What a voice!" said the Princess Metternich. "And what a loss for music," said Belgioioso, "if your husband had had me hanged!" As to us—members of the Chancellor's diplomatic staff—the gilded youth of Milan affected an extreme intimacy. There were indeed some irreconcileables—Manzoni, the author of the *Promessi Sposi*, was one—but their number was insignificant; and I never doubted the sincerity of the demonstrations of attachment and loyalty which marked the journey of the sovereign through the kingdom. And now, ten years later, in 1848, what is the state of things? Everything is changed: but why?'

In attempting to answer this question, Baron Hübner dwells on the developement of 'national sentiment' since the time of the Napoleonic wars; but though great weight must be attributed to this, he considers it of less importance than the spread of 'liberal opinion' and the growth of 'secret 'societies' bent on the destruction of all existing institutions.

'The transformation of the Spanish colonies into independent republics is but one instance of the effect due to the united action of these two powers. It is now the turn of Italy, which has become the gathering place of all the enemies of Austria. And these are numerous. The "liberals" have never liked her, and the "sects" hate her if only because she is the stronghold of the Christian religion which they wish to destroy.'

Oppression, cruelty, tyranny, material grievances were, he affirms, non-existent; but here, with the narrative of the Spielberg present to our memory, we must differ very strongly from the Baron. Still, there was no attempt to enforce or even to encourage the use of German; Italian was the official language; but as every grade in the public service was open to the Italians, many of them voluntarily learned German in order to qualify themselves for appointments in the German provinces; many of the nobles served in the army; many were in the diplomatic service; many appeared at court, mixed in Viennese society, and intermarried with the Austrian aristocracy. From all which it resulted that a certain knowledge of German had become common enough in the upper and middle classes. But in 1848 this knowledge suddenly disappeared; and in conformity with an order from their leaders, everybody

affected complete ignorance of the language. From the material point of view, Baron Hübner maintains, Lombardy had very little to complain of; the Austrian rule had given it order, and, with order, prosperity.

'But,' he continues, 'material happiness alone does not suffice for the aspirations of the human heart. The system of intellectual repression, applied to all subjects of the Austrian monarchy, was felt by the intelligent classes in this country. I will only mention the censorship of the press, which has always existed in Italy and, I believe, in all Catholic countries. It used to be directed by the bishop, who confined himself to what related to doctrines and to morals. The State censorship meddles with everything, and is entrusted to minor *employés*, whose horizon is as narrow as it well can be. The Austrian system prevails, in different degrees, in all the States of the peninsula, so that we are accused of having introduced and of maintaining, in Italy as in Austria, a rule which condemns the mind to perpetual captivity, and subjects its evolutions to the control of the State.'

He then sums up this lengthy but interesting discussion.

'In examining the present crisis, I see malcontents desirous of shaking off the restraints of governments; I see the enthusiastic votaries of a free and united Italy; I see the liberals of every country in Europe sympathising with these aspirations and calling for a constitution *à la Louis-Philippe* as a panacea. I see also the secret societies, which are aiming at something quite different, but which smile on all these others, who are simple enough to court their alliance. And one more element I see: the traditional ambition of the House of Savoy. It is due to her defects as much as to her qualities that Austria now finds this formidable coalition ranged against her.'

The defects specially meant by the Baron were the irresolution and want of vigour of the home government in suppressing a conspiracy which was almost openly avowed. One curious instance of this occurred in connexion with an anti-tobacco demonstration which, in itself, recalls the anti-tea riots in our North American colonies in 1773. Tobacco was a government monopoly, and was accordingly prohibited by the leaders of the revolutionary movement. The order was to take effect from January 1, 1848, and on that day all who smoked in the streets were insulted. These were principally officers in plain clothes and soldiers. The natural result was a series of riots which culminated on January 3 in a sanguinary combat in which many men were grievously wounded and two killed outright. The governor requested Radetzky to forbid his officers and soldiers to smoke in public; this the marshal refused to do, but he did forbid the officers to wear plain clothes. Similar disturbances followed at Pavia and at Venice; at Padua the soldiers stormed a café in which

the students had barricaded themselves, killing five or six of them and wounding many more. Had it not been for the intervention of the officers, the carnage might have been very serious; but the government took no measures to maintain the peace beyond issuing placards imploring the citizens 'to 'be good boys,' and everywhere, by its apathy or timidity, seemed to invite further insolence and attack. On February 24 martial law was proclaimed, but with limitations that rendered it nugatory, and the revolutionary party became bolder each day. The revolution in Vienna and the downfall of Metternich on March 13 brought matters to a head. The news reached Milan on the afternoon of the 17th, and on the morning of the 18th the revolt declared itself. For that and the following day the fighting in the streets was extremely lively. Hübner, who had only just entered on apartments in the royal palace, rightly judged that that would be the chief point of the insurgents' attack, and quitting it, he took shelter in the rooms of a Viennese lady who lived opposite, and whose husband, being absent at the time, had not been able to return. His position was scarcely improved, for as all the adjacent windows were held by the assailants, the garrison of the palace made no distinction and fired on all alike. It was, too, not improbable that the house might be carried at the point of the bayonet, and that the infuriated soldiers—especially if Croats, ignorant of German—might be unable to discriminate. The only resource was to fortify themselves with mattresses and paillasses, and to give the women directions to scream lustily when the time arrived. The danger, however, was not realised; the firing ceased at dusk on the evening of the 19th, and during the night the imperial troops evacuated the palace. On the 20th the streets were thronged with men, women, and children, wearing green, white, and red ribbons, and shouting *Evviva*; and, not to be singular, Hübner decked his windows with the national colours. 'C'est toujours,' he says, 'l'ancienne 'histoire de Saint Pierre, qui par prudence renie le Seigneur.' At midday they left the house, and without difficulty reached that in which Mme. ——'s husband had found a refuge. She was heartily welcomed, but Baron Hübner at once saw that the presence of the chancellor's representative was far from agreeable, and towards evening he took his departure, his host finding him a lodging with an elderly couple, whom he speaks of as Philemon and Baucis. Philemon was an Italian-Tyrolese; Baucis, a Milanaise. 'I think myself,' she said, 'as good an Italian as these noisy fellows; but I

'have always held to Austria, and I always will. My hus-
'band has given in his adhesion to the new government. I
'am sorry for it. You are welcome here, and shall stay with
'us as long as it suits you.'

Milan was now entirely in the hands of the insurgents. Radetzky, finding his position within the town untenable, withdrew to the castle; but he occupied the lines and the gates in force, and thus instituted an effective blockade, from which there was no hope of relief except by the action of the King of Sardinia. If the Piedmontese did not advance at once, the town must surrender. Count Casati, formerly podestà, or mayor, now the leader of the insurrection, and his fellows were unwilling 'to burn their boats,' and announced that they were acting provisionally 'in the absence 'of the imperial authorities.' This, added to information which he had picked up in the afternoon, led Baron Hübner to suppose that they were wavering, and would return to their allegiance if they were persuaded that their trust in Charles Albert was vain; whilst, on the other hand, it was quite certain that without their support Charles Albert would not cross the Ticino. So on the morning of the 21st he wrote to Casati requesting an interview. 'It is,' he wrote, 'delivering myself to the insurgents; but it is a last attempt 'to find a way out of the mess we are in, which is assuredly 'worth a personal sacrifice; and in any case these gentlemen 'will no longer be able to say that all the functionaries of the 'emperor have hidden themselves or run away.' As he was conducted to the place of meeting he had an opportunity of seeing the state of the town—the pavements torn up for the construction of barricades, the peasants and citizens under arms for their defence, ecclesiastics with tricoloured cockades in their hats and sabres by their sides, and the *signori* dressed after a picture by Velasquez or Paolo Veronese, in black velvet doublet, Venetian mantle, and a huge *sombrero* with an enormous plume of ostrich feathers.

'But during all our long route,' he says, 'notwithstanding the profusion of three-coloured flags, notwithstanding all the preparations for combat and the deafening shouts of *Viva l'Italia! Viva Pio Nono!* I was struck by the absence of genuine heartiness. To speak frankly, the warlike element seemed wanting. The men of the better classes appeared nervous, absent, preoccupied; their countenances showed neither the exaltation of enthusiasm, nor the firmness and severity of men ready to give their lives for an idea. Only the children and the working men seemed truly happy; the first, at being let off going to school; the second, at being quit of the workshop. To have no work

and to be fed at the cost of the municipality, that indeed was for them the new era of liberty, and explains why they were so ready to cry, in their jerky Lombard accent, *Viva l'I-ta-li-a li-be-ra!*'

It must, of course, be understood that these are the impressions of an Austrian; but of a singularly capable Austrian, trained to quick and accurate observation, and forced, by the circumstances of the time, to look the difficulties of the position fairly in the face. In his interview with Casati he stated the case as it had appeared to him. If Charles Albert still hesitated, the situation of the insurgents was simply desperate, unless at the last—the present—hour some agreement could be come to with the marshal. This Casati would neither admit nor deny; but his vague language, his worn and anxious look, and his embarrassed conduct, showed that he knew nothing of the actual intentions of the King of Sardinia. In the evening, however, Hübner was told by Philemon that a messenger had got into the town and brought Charles Albert's formal promise to cross the Ticino with his army as soon as he received an invitation from the committee. This was confirmed the next morning by the announcement of the formation of a provisional government, with Casati as president; and in the afternoon notice was given that the town was to be bombarded. About five o'clock the first gun was heard, and the firing gradually became faster till the roar of it was incessant. At one o'clock in the morning it ceased.

'I do not think,' wrote Baron Hübner, 'that we ran any great danger, the marshal, in default of shell, having limited himself to sending us cannon-ball, which made more noise than damage; but to serve for six hours as a target to a hundred guns is decidedly disagreeable. I do not know and cannot understand what object father Radetzky had in view in treating us in this manner. . . . If he wished to punish the rebels by making them pass a sleepless night, he succeeded, for every one thought his last hour was come; but he signally failed if he hoped to intimidate the provisional government and to bring them to terms. Milan has not capitulated, and he has been obliged to raise the siege and retire. For the time, the capital of Lombardy is lost to Austria. Our troops quit it, and the loyal servants of the emperor who are left behind have fallen into the hands of a power wielded to-day by the *signori*, to-morrow, perhaps, by the lowest rabble. *Enfin, vogue la galère, et à la garde de Dieu!*'

And so the *Cinque Giornate* came to an end; the revolution was an accomplished fact; Radetzky had retired; Milan was in the hands of the provisional government; and so, too, was Baron Hübner. He was, however, permitted to remain

undisturbed in his little room at Philemon's, under the surveillance of his landlord.

'The life,' he wrote, 'is terribly monotonous, though now and then some trifling incidents give it a little variety. Every evening, for instance, troops of men march through the street calling out *Fuori i lumi!* "set out your lights!" and every one hastens to put a candle in his window. This is always in celebration of some imaginary victory, or, still better, of the death of Radetzky, killed by his soldiers or by some fine fellow or other. Every one knows that it is all pure invention, but it serves to keep the populace in good humour. For the first few days after the departure of the army, some forty idiots used to collect before our house regularly every evening, and for half an hour cry out in chorus *Morte, morte al Tedesco!* with the accompanying pantomime of extending the arm at the first syllable, drawing it in at the second, and pointing the finger at the window of my room.'

This amusement ran its course, and was succeeded by cries addressed to robbers, *Morte ai ladri!* while official placards announced that *Chi ruba è Tedesco*, 'Whoever 'steals is a German.' The government exerted itself to prevent serious disorders, and, on the whole, with success.

On April 1 Baron Hübner had another interview with Casati, consequent on which he was authorised to carry to Radetzky a proposal for the exchange of prisoners, or, in the phrase of the day, hostages. He accordingly set out at half-past two, and reached Brescia the same evening. Here he was stopped. The mob was dominant; the ignorant populace refused to believe that some trickery was not intended, and insisted on Hübner's being brought before the committee the next morning. The Milanese officer appointed to conduct him was rudely hustled, and fled in terror. The Piedmontese troops, already quartered in the town, did not interfere; the mob swarmed on, over, and around the carriage shouting *Morte!* and working themselves up to a pitch of excitement and fury till they were as though mad drunk. Fortunately no accident occurred, and he was saved from a fate that seemed imminent by the exertions of a gentleman who, mingling with the mob, made himself a conspicuous feature of it, brandishing a naked sword and calling out, with the voice of a Stentor, '*Morte! Morte!* '—but not by the hands of the people—it would be too 'much honour—by the hands of the hangman—not now—'to-morrow.' Other gentlemen, 'belonging to the best 'families of the town,' then forced their way through the crowd and constituted themselves a bodyguard, till at length a party of soldiers, deserters from one of the

Lombard regiments, came up and formed on each side of the carriage. At the sight of the white uniform, though qualified by the tricoloured ribbon, the mob dispersed and fled; in a few minutes the street was empty. The terrible danger from which he so narrowly escaped naturally turned Baron Hübner's thoughts to the risks incident to revolution and popular supremacy, and many pages of his journal are occupied in the examination of them. By the nominal government of Brescia he was received courteously enough, and with profuse apologies for the *émeute* of which he had so nearly been the victim; but when the subject of his mission was broached, the commandant of the Piedmontese troops showed himself distinctly adverse to it, and the committee decided that, as the Piedmontese had been invited to assist them, they were bound to leave this matter in their hands. So on April 6 Hübner was sent back to Milan, which he found keeping high holiday, to celebrate the arrival of Princess Belgioioso with 180 young Neapolitans. After being fêted for a few days these budding heroes were put into the train and sent on to the seat of war. Three weeks later all that remained of them were some twenty tattered wretches, who were begging in the streets of Milan. They had never seen the enemy, but they were caught plundering by the peasants, and were pretty well exterminated.

Meanwhile Baron Hübner had returned to his former quarters with Philemon and Baucis, where he remained for the next three months a prisoner on parole and under *surveillance*. He managed to get his newspapers forwarded through Switzerland, and these furnished him with food for thought and speculation, much of which he recorded in his journal. He could occasionally go for a stroll, sometimes alone, more commonly with Philemon; but his principal resource was reading; and in this age of enquiry as to 'the 'hundred best books,' it may be interesting to note that Baron Hübner's favourites during these weary weeks were the histories of Macchiavelli, Guicciardini, Botta, and Johannes Müller, diluted now and then with the novels of Cervantes, Fielding, and Smollett. Between whiles he conversed with Baucis, won the confidence of Giovannina, the bright-eyed, blackhaired, and exceedingly grimy maid-of-all-work, a Milanese 'Marchioness,' and played patience. 'I 'only know one sort,' he wrote, 'but it is enough; and each 'evening I devote myself with fresh pleasure to this harm-'less game, which used to appear the very height of *ennui*.' And so the time passed away till, on July 4, he was told

that his imprisonment was at an end, and that on the next day he would be sent on by diligence to Chur, under sufficient escort. He protested against the diligence; and on formally relieving the committee of the responsibility, signing a document to that effect, he was allowed to proceed in his own carriage, without any escort at all. Risk, he says, there was none, for the peasants along the road were entirely Austrian in their sympathies. He left Milan at three o'clock in the morning, and thus had an opportunity of witnessing the glorious effect of sunrise on the distant mountain peaks, as the isolated bright points changed to 'a 'river of rubies.'

'At every relay a little crowd of countrymen and others of the lower class collected. The *signori* were still sleeping. So much the better. Their sloth permitted me to see none but smiling faces. One of these men said to me, "Pleasant journey, General, and a speedy return." At another station, a group of peasants gathered round my carriage. An old man of venerable appearance said to me, "When is this dear Radetzky coming? Why does he wait so long?"'

Under these auspices Baron Hübner bade farewell to Italy. It was the occasion of a lengthy entry in his journal on the present and future prospects of the country; the occasion also of a chapter of recent date, comparing his speculations in 1848 with the accomplished facts of 1890. The comparison well deserves a careful study, and one point calls for especial notice, the more so as it by no means agrees with the general opinion in this country. We have already referred to Baron Hübner's belief that in 1848 the Austrian province had few or no material grievances; that the grievances which brought about the revolutions then and afterwards were sentimental—intellectual—affecting the intelligent classes. He now considers that although the unification of Italy has to a great extent removed the sentimental difficulty, it has introduced material ills; and that from a material point of view the condition of the lower classes is less satisfactory than it was in the old time. Increasing poverty induces increasing emigration, and at the present day Italians are to be found everywhere. In the Argentine Republic, by their intermarriage with the Indians, they are forming a new race, which appears destined to replace the Gauchos of the Pampas; and since this book was written, the disgraceful riots in the United States and the terrible disaster in the Bay of Gibraltar have called attention to the enormous extent of Italian emigration to North America. Formerly the military and administrative establishments

were insignificant; the taxation was little more than nominal; everywhere, but especially in the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, the public finances were in an excellent state.

'Now, everything is changed. The need of a vast administrative service, rising out of the extent of territory; of a formidable army, on account of the neighbourhood of two of the greatest military powers; of a navy of the first class for the defence of its coasts; of gigantic public works which are, or are deemed to be, indispensable; in short, all the numerous, complicated, and costly requirements of the modern state impose on the new "United Kingdom" duties and expenses which were unknown under the old governments. To find the means to meet all these wants without exhausting the vital springs of the national prosperity is one of the great problems which it is called on to solve. And the difficulties of this task, arduous under ordinary circumstances, are singularly increased by the abnormal state of Europe, which, in order to live at peace, is obliged to live on a war footing. Such a state of things is unnatural and cannot be prolonged indefinitely; but who will live to see the end of it? who will survive the crisis? Has the kingdom of Italy the stuff of which great powers are made? The future alone can answer the question. I will not try to penetrate its secrets, but will confine myself to expressing a supposition rather than a positive opinion. The new kingdom owes its origin to its diplomacy much more than to its army. Will it not always be a diplomatic rather than a military state? thus presenting, in magnified proportions, a certain analogy to the Republic of St. Mark, which, thanks to the management of its foreign policy, was able, in the time of its greatness, to preserve its independence intact amid the rivalries and conflicts of Austria and France. Even now, does it not owe to its diplomacy, rather than to its army and navy, however respectable they may be, the importance which the world assigns it since it became allied with Germany and Austria, united for the defence of European peace? I would ask, too, if the counsellors of the King of Italy have not hoped, and reasonably hoped, to find in the alliance with these two great monarchies an element of strength against the Italian republicans.'

After a fortnight's stay in Switzerland, Baron Hübner arrived at Vienna on July 22, and from that date his journal is chiefly occupied with the affairs of the Austrian capital and his own work during a very critical period, though it does mention on July 27 that on the 23rd Radetzky had resumed the offensive; two days later, that he had gained a decisive victory over the King of Sardinia at Custozza; again, that he had entered Milan on August 6, and been well received by the populace; and on August 14 that an armistice had been concluded, the Piedmontese troops retiring behind the Ticino. But Lombardy was only one and a remote province of the empire, and insurrection was everywhere except in the Tyrol. Bohemia had been

reduced to its old allegiance by the energetic measures of Prince Windischgrätz, but in Austria proper, in Hungary, and in all the other provinces, disorder and revolt were supreme. The emperor had fled to Innsbruck, but the shopkeepers of Vienna bemoaned the absence of the court, and the 'Committee of Public Safety,' which had usurped the supreme authority, objected to the rival power, the sovereign, being out of reach and in dangerous proximity to the army of Radetzky. They desired him to return, and he did return, making a public entry into Vienna on August 12. 'A lamentable spectacle,' wrote Baron Hübner, who witnessed it.

On the principle that 'all's well that ends well,' we in England have accustomed ourselves to think that the insurrections of 1848 were of comparatively trifling importance, and that the revolution in Vienna was merely a rather serious riot. At the time they did not appear so to those who were interested in them, and Hübner in Vienna repeatedly compares the state of things there with that in Paris in 1789 and the following years, watching anxiously its approach to that in 1793. That it did not reach this, that order was restored, that reform instead of revolution was the final adjustment, was mainly due to the exertions of the able men who were called to the support of the constitution, and especially of Windischgrätz and Felix Schwarzenberg. In all positions of authority, whether as master of a school, as tutor of a college, as colonel of a regiment, as captain of a ship, or as ruler of a great empire, the very worst type of official is the good-natured, easy-going man, who from weakness, indolence, or kindness of heart, lets things slide, relaxes the reins of discipline, and allows those under his command to go as the spirit moves them. How much of the woes of France and of Europe in and after 1789 resulted from the weakness of Louis XVI. is patent to every student of history; and the troubles of Vienna and of Austria in 1848 were largely due to the weakness of the Emperor Ferdinand, and, still more, of his ministers. Baron Wessenberg, who had succeeded Metternich as president, was known as a man of ability, and had served creditably as a diplomatist; as an administrator or ruler he had no experience. He is described as a most amiable and well-meaning man, but he was 75 years of age, 'of weak character and broken constitution.' Count Latour, the Minister of War, 'as honourable a man as ever lived, a 'brave soldier, and loyal subject of the emperor,' repeatedly

showed himself wanting in the sternness or hardness of character necessary in his position in critical times, and in the end perished miserably, a victim to his own weakness and indecision. There was no one about the court who was capable of taking the reins of government, and almost from his first arrival Hübner formed the opinion that the man wanted there was Prince Felix von Schwarzenberg. But Schwarzenberg was with the army in Italy, where, on the conclusion of the armistice, he had been nominated plenipotentiary. Hübner's desire was to see him at Vienna, and with this in view called on Latour.

'We talked,' he says, 'without restraint, and I found the general's opinion in entire agreement with mine. Seeing this, I begged him to invite Prince Felix to come here. This, however, he positively refused to do. "It would," he said to me, "be wanting in loyalty to my colleagues But," he added, "if you like to write to Milan, I will put a War Office courier at your disposal." Naturally, I accepted the offer. It would, of course, have been much better if the minister himself had written, but I understand and respect his scruples. Accordingly, on going home, I wrote my letter to Prince Felix, and have despatched it by Count Latour's courier. It is a faithful account of the situation. I have not said *Come*, but it amounts to that.'

It is quite possible that Schwarzenberg received similar letters from others in Vienna, but few of them can have had the weight of this written by a man in Hübner's position, with the implied consent of the minister of war; so that it is clear that much of the credit of Schwarzenberg's subsequent appointment is due to Hübner. This, however, is not a point on which then or now he lays much stress. It was enough for him that Schwarzenberg did arrive, though not till the end of September. Meanwhile few days passed without riots more or less serious, and insults to the emperor more or less gross, and notably only one from the 'Academic Legion,' which at a review received him in grim silence, with its band playing, 'Was macht der lederne 'Herr Papa?' Still it was evident that against the committee, against the students, against the rabble which was joined with them, there were many of a better class, including the national guard, amidst whom conservative and loyal principles still bore sway, and who could be counted on to defend the constitution and the emperor in time of need, if only they had a leader they could trust. On August 21 and following days there were serious riots, consequent, it was alleged, on the reduction of the wages on the government works. The national guard stood firm and supported the

police, and after some severe fighting, in which fifteen or twenty were killed and upwards of one hundred wounded, order was restored. Consequent on what they considered the reactionary attitude of the national guard, the 'Committee of Public Safety' dissolved itself, leaving the Reichstag to represent the popular element of government, in which capacity it negatived, with hooting and ridicule, the proposed vote of thanks to Marshal Radetzky and the army of Italy. Thus supported, the revolutionary party waxed stronger and more insolent, and foreign emissaries, unhindered, daily harangued the rabble, exciting it to violence.

On September 30 Schwarzenberg arrived. Notwithstanding the letters he had received, he does not seem to have understood the very critical state of affairs—that the very existence of the monarchy was at stake, and that Vienna had become a principal focus of the European revolution. In consultation with Hübner the situation seems to have been passed in review, in some such form as this:—

'At Schönbrunn the emperor, in weak health, deprived of all power, and, together with the Imperial family, virtually a prisoner. Without prompt assistance it is but a stage on the way to the Temple and the Conciergerie. A ministry, willing, it may be, but not able to contend with the extreme factions, hampered, too, by engagements it has made, and composed of incongruous elements—as Wessenberg, a liberal of the type of 1789, always aiming at conciliation, and always drawn into new concessions; Latour, who hopes to save the State by acting on the outer surface, the periphery, whilst leaving the centre in the hands of the barricade makers; and Bach, the only man of note in the Cabinet, an 1830 liberal, and now engaged in an unequal struggle against the cause which he has helped to its triumph. And lastly, the Assembly, the Reichstag, bearing the impress of the revolution of May, from which it sprang, and invested with sovereign powers which it has usurped: however, the majority in it, more and more frightened by the red spectre, now and again, at long intervals, manifests some slight wish to resist. Such is the situation. Next, as to the means of getting out of it. First of all, to remove the court from the neighbourhood of Vienna to some sure place. As soon as possible to dismiss the ministry, which is in pretty much the case of a fly in a spider's web. Lastly, whilst waiting till the Assembly can be dissolved, to leave it to flounder in the vicious circle in which it has got entangled. But the essential point is that the emperor, on regaining his freedom, shall refuse any further concession, which will only be possible if the relations between the Court and the Assembly are definitely broken.'

The crisis, however, was nearer than the friends in council had expected, and before any steps could be taken the eruption of rebellion had a new and more violent access.

On October 5, Jellachich, the Ban of Croatia, was nominated Governor-General of Hungary. The announcement was made a pretext for the rising which the Socialist leaders had long prepared, and early in the morning of the 6th an attack was made on the military posts in the city. Some of the soldiers, and especially the magnificent regiment of Hrabowsky Grenadiers, had been seduced from their allegiance and joined the insurgents. Through the inner town the battle raged with continually increasing fury. In obedience to instructions from the Minister of War, the commandant of the garrison directed an advance from the suburbs in three separate columns, converging on the Hof, to meet in front of the War Office, the *Kriegs-Ministerium*. They were already in the town, when new orders were sent for them to fall back and wait on the glacis. As on all former occasions Latour, after some show of resistance, had recalled the soldiers and abandoned the ground to the anarchists, no one was now surprised; and though everyone saw how fatal the step must be, the orders were peremptory, and were obeyed. At the same time, whether in panic, in treachery, or, as seems more probable, in obedience to orders given by Latour himself, the troops stationed in the Hof for the defence of the War Office, where the ministers were assembled, quitted their post, abandoning their guns. By these measures the town was given up to the insurgents. The mob seized on the guns, broke into the building, spread through its apartments. The ministers had scarcely time to fly. Bach escaped in the livery of a servant. Wessenberg, counting on not being known by sight, walked quietly out.

'Latour, brave and noble in heart, though weak as a politician, refused to desert the post of danger. He remained alone in the room which his colleagues had left. A few moments later, the door was burst open; a student, followed by some *sans-culottes*, rushed in and seized the general by the collar, but was immediately repelled by an aide-de-camp, who ran up to his chief's assistance. Thus freed, Latour slipped down a private staircase, and took refuge in a little closet on the ground floor. If he had remained quietly there, it is probable that he would not have been discovered by the madmen who at the time were swarming all over the palace, several of them being immediately outside the door of the closet. But hoping, apparently, to calm them, he conceived the unfortunate notion of quitting his asylum and presenting himself before his murderers. A workman dealt him the first blow with a bludgeon; in a few moments he was a corpse, shockingly mutilated, hacked, torn almost to rags. Faithful to the grand traditions of the Terror of 1792 and 1793, they hung it to one

of the lamp-posts in front of the palace; and men, women, and even children, drunk with wine and blood, wildly gesticulating and shouting, executed an infernal saraband round it.'

The next day the emperor and the court quitted Schönbrunn. The insurgents, having possession of the inner town, plundered the arsenals, while the commandant of the garrison kept the troops inactive on the glacis. 'A brave 'soldier,' says Baron Hübner, 'but weak, irresolute, and 'overwhelmed by the weight of responsibility, he seems 'scarcely up to the level of his task.' On the 9th Schwarzenberg received orders to join the emperor at Olmütz; but as he was convinced that his departure would be the signal for the withdrawal of the soldiers and the total loss of Vienna, he resolved to send Hübner instead, with an explanation of his reason for not going himself. What he was principally to urge on the empress and the archdukes was that deputations from the Reichstag should not be received. He was to represent that the loyal majority no longer existed; most of those who composed it had taken flight, the rest were virtually prisoners. No concessions could be granted till the rebellion was suppressed.

'The existence of the monarchy,' added Schwarzenberg, 'hangs by a thread. If Jellachich does not arrive in time to drive back the Hungarians before they can effect a junction with the rebels of Vienna; if Windischgrätz is not able to advance at once on the capital; if, by a prompt conclusion of peace with Sardinia—which is scarcely probable—a great part of Radetzky's army is not made available, I do not see where we are to find the means necessary to crush the revolution. The defection of the army in Lombardy, in Hungary, at Vienna, is a shameful example, which may be contagious, and is very disquieting.'

Baron Hübner joined the court on the evening of the 10th, and after succeeding in preventing the reception of a deputation from the Reichstag on the 12th, and seeing a messenger despatched to Schwarzenberg on the 13th, with orders for him to join the court immediately, he was sent on to Prague with letters to Windischgrätz, desiring him to advance on Vienna at once. He was then able to describe, with a detail which the prince had not yet received, the state of affairs in Vienna and at the court, by that time probably arrived at Olmütz, where 'peace, quiet, safety, and '(I hope) Prince Felix await it.' '"Now," I said in con- 'clusion, "all that is wanting is Prince Windischgrätz and '"his army." "My army," he answered, "is a rather '"pompous phrase. I will take twenty squadrons, twelve

'"battalions, and seven batteries: that is the total. But '"still it is something, and will, I hope, be sufficient to set '"these rascals to rights."' Hübner left Prague that same afternoon by the first military train.

'The enthusiasm of the troops and officers,' he wrote, 'is indescribable. They are going, they say, to avenge the insult offered to the emperor, to revenge Latour, chastise the students, deliver the good Viennese. Everywhere the train is greeted with the *Gott erhalte*—the national hymn. The soldiers dance at the stations, sing in the carriages, and in spite of the noise of the engine make the air resound with cheers for the emperor. One would say that they were going to a wedding, or rather that they were coming from one. The people everywhere fraternise with them. The insurrection at Prague, so promptly suppressed by Windischgrätz, does not seem to have left any trace in the country.'

On arriving at Olmütz, Windischgrätz was promoted to the rank of marshal, and appointed commander-in-chief of all the troops of the imperial army, with the exception of those placed under the orders of Marshal Radetzky. At the same time a manifesto was issued to the effect that Prince Windischgrätz was charged to pacify the country with the least possible delay; and that, when that was done, the ministry, in concert with the Reichstag, would provide means for insuring respect to the law without prejudice to liberty. This announcement of a determination to suppress the rebellion by force of arms rather than by conciliatory measures and by concessions to the Reichstag, was strongly objected to by Wessenberg, the nominal head of the ministry, and by Count Stadion, the future Minister for Home Affairs; and in deference to their opinion a second edition of the manifesto was promulgated, the same in substance, but somewhat modified in form, prepared—as Baron Hübner expresses it—*ad usum Delphini*. Whether any measures of conciliation could have restored order may very well be doubted. Schwarzenberg and Windischgrätz were both convinced to the contrary, and held firmly to the opinion that to offer any concessions to armed rebels would be a fatal error. But, in any case, the Reichstag could scarcely have been negotiated with. Things within the city had been running their accustomed course; the Reichstag had become a 'rump;' and the 'rump,' dominated by the party of violence, had ceased to have any authority. The power had passed into the hands of different committees, and especially of the 'Committee of Democrats,' composed mostly of foreign emissaries—Swiss, Poles, Prussian, French; it was this, according to Baron Hübner's in-

formation, that kept alive the ferment, organised the insurrection, provided the means for resistance, and imposed its will on the populace and on the other clubs. Naturally the chiefs of the several government departments had fled, though many of the clerks continued at their posts and carried on the routine of their office. Baron Krauss, the Minister of Finance, had, however, remained, and, though of undoubted loyalty, affected a good understanding with the students. Baron Hübner gives a curious account of his very peculiar policy.

'"They are," he said to me during one of his frequent visits to Olmütz, "they are children, a little misguided, it is true, but good at bottom." If they are planning any atrocious design, he harangues them, cajoles them, beseeches them—seldom in vain—not to be so naughty, to be "good boys." If they want a little money for arms, he advances (!!) them some out of the State funds, and all goes for the best. He has greater difficulty in getting on with the democratic committee—arrant rascals, every one of them; but if he is not on a footing of intimacy with them, he manages to conciliate them by financial measures. He has thus hitherto been able to prevent the pillage of the national bank, public establishments, and customs' warehouses. When he is here, he relates these little transactions with the enemy with a charming *naïveté*. Marshal Windischgrätz disposes of the resources of the State to bombard the capital, and his Majesty's minister furnishes the rebels with the means to defend it. "Why, it's high treason!" I cried. "Oh, dear no!" he said, with a quiet smile; "the poor fellows are not grasping; they are content with homœopathic doses; and, besides, the money I give them goes to the *cantinières* rather than to the armourers" I do not believe such a thing was ever heard of before, except, perhaps, in the Iberian peninsula; and even there one would say *son cosas de España*.'

Meantime Windischgrätz was preparing, without delay, to put an end to this state of anarchy. On October 20 he proclaimed Vienna and its neighbourhood in a state of siege; the civil authorities were placed under the orders of the military; martial law was declared. On the 23rd the troops began to encompass the town. The marshal had got together an army of 60,000 men, and on the 24th he gave the Viennese forty-eight hours to consider their position. On the 26th he commenced active hostilities, and on the 28th carried the suburbs by assault, and occupied the glacis up to the foot of the bastions of the inner town. From a military point of view, Vienna lay at the mercy of the army, and Messenhauser, the commander of the rebels, insisted on capitulating. A deputation was sent to the marshal, and it was agreed that the troops should occupy the town the next

morning. But the next morning an Hungarian army, 25,000 strong, advanced to within three or four leagues of Vienna, when they were overtaken, defeated, and scattered by the *corps d'armée* commanded by Jellachich. The occupation agreed on was meantime delayed, and the party of violence, trusting in the success of the Hungarians, overruled Messenhauser's protest, and broke the capitulation. Then followed a night of the wildest confusion and anarchy. The vilest dregs of the population, men and women, thronged the streets, while the orators of the gutter excited them to fire the town, plunder the bank, exterminate the imperialists. Foremost and loudest among these was Robert Blum, a Saxon demagogue, who roared, 'There are still two thousand 'persons whom you ought to *latourise*.'

On the morning of the 31st the rabble were masters of the town, and calling out for a defence *à outrance*. But their military skill and resources were not equal to their venom; and when Windischgrätz, not choosing to risk his men in the horrors of street fighting, opened a general bombardment, the defence collapsed at once. In two hours all opposition ceased; the town was in flames, and seemed in imminent danger of total destruction. Fortunately a heavy rain followed, and during the night the fire was extinguished. The next day the troops entered; many of the leaders of the rebellion had escaped; many were captured, and amongst them Messenhauser and Blum. Messenhauser was tried, found guilty, condemned, and executed. Blum, an infinitely more atrocious criminal, a native of Leipzig, insolently claimed immunity as a member of the Frankfort parliament. The marshal wrote privately to Schwarzenberg, still at Olmütz, that, to avoid diplomatic entanglements, he thought it would be better simply to expel him from Austrian territory. Schwarzenberg replied that the diplomatic difficulties were his concern, and he would take the responsibility. Blum should be brought before a court-martial, and, if condemned, should be executed. And this was done. He was sentenced to be hanged, but as no hangman was available he was shot.

As had been foreseen, the execution caused a tremendous excitement throughout Germany. From every parliament or club, from every square or market-place, were heard execrations of the sanguinary tyrants of Vienna. The rage of the anarchists was only equalled by their consternation, and it was everywhere felt that the death of Blum was a fatal blow to the revolution. At the time Baron Hübner thought that the conduct of Prince Felix in this matter was

in accordance with justice, courage, and sound policy, and deserved the thanks and the gratitude not only of Austria but of Europe; and after more than forty years' reflection he thinks so still.

The suppression of the revolution in Vienna seemed to mark the fitting time for carrying out certain reforms in the constitution, and as a preliminary two measures already determined on, one of which was of an unusual and indeed extraordinary nature. On November 21 the new ministry was formed, with Schwarzenberg as president. No one was more pleased than old Baron Wessenberg, whose position had been an extremely embarrassing one. A curious blunder in connexion with his retirement calls attention to the confusion which everywhere prevailed. The emperor sent him the Grand Cross of St. Stephen; the baron respectfully returned it, having been a Grand Cross of the order since the time of the Congress of Vienna. A change of ministry, however, is no very unwonted occurrence; the other measure to which we have referred had a wider and graver importance.

For many years the emperor had been weak, both in body and in mind; the cares of his position overwhelmed him, and the empress had repeatedly consulted Prince Metternich as to the possibility or advisability of his abdicating the throne. At last, in 1847, it was decided that he should abdicate in favour of his nephew, Francis Joseph, as soon as the young archduke attained the age of 18—that is, on August 18, 1848. When, on March 13, 1848, Metternich himself resigned, the empress sent for him, and insisted that the abdication ought to take place at once. She feared that the revolutionary leaders might obtain from the emperor some unworthy concession. It was only with great difficulty that the prince persuaded her to wait till the archduke came of age. After Metternich's departure Prince Windischgrätz became the confidant of the empress, and he, too, implored her to be patient. She acquiesced for the time, and the troubles which followed seemed to render it each month inexpedient to make so serious a change. At Olmütz the empress consulted Schwarzenberg, and he, in concert with Windischgrätz, and with the father and mother of the young archduke, agreed that the abdication should take place in the end of November. The common opinion that it was in itself a violent measure, forced on the crown by the progress and strength of the revolution, or in deference to a strong public feeling against the Emperor

Ferdinand, is entirely incorrect, and indeed at absolute variance with the facts. Perhaps the most extraordinary thing about the business was the perfect secrecy which was preserved. The members of the imperial family, the ministers and high functionaries, all the generals and superior officers at Olmütz, were summoned to attend at court at eight o'clock in the morning of December 2. It was known that Prince Windischgrätz and the Ban of Croatia had arrived, and it was clear that some important event was on foot, but nobody had any idea of what it was. Even when assembled in the waiting-room on the morning of the 2nd, no one knew, not even the brothers of the Archduke Francis Joseph, who both asked Baron Hübner what it all meant. The truth was not known till the emperor himself, speaking from the throne, revealed it; and

'Prince Felix of Schwarzenberg, generally so cold, so impassive, but now visibly moved, read the formal declaration of the archduke's majority, his father's act of renunciation, and lastly, the emperor's act of abdication. His Majesty and his brother having signed these documents, the young emperor came forward, and on his knees received his uncle's benediction. 'May God bless thee!' said Ferdinand I. to him; 'sei brav, es ist gerne geschehen.'

The abdication of Ferdinand I. may be considered as the closing act of the Austrian revolution. The war in Hungary, which continued into the next year, and was brought to an end only by the intervention of Russia, stands in a different category, partaking rather of the nature of war, even if it ought to be called civil war. But in any case Baron Hübner's connexion with it was of the slightest, and in March 1849 he was appointed ambassador at Paris. With that he closes the journal, to which his official position, his personal share in the transactions referred to, and his familiar intercourse with the principal actors in them, give a very exceptional value as a contribution to history; to which the quaint humour and the artistic instincts of the writer give a very exceptional interest as a contribution to literature.

ART. VII.—*Life of Archibald Campbell Tait, Archbishop of Canterbury.* By RANDALL THOMAS DAVIDSON, D.D., Dean of Windsor; and WILLIAM BENHAM, B.D., Hon. Canon of Canterbury. 2 vols. London: 1891.

AT no period of its existence since the Reformation has the Church of England given birth to men more eminent than the churchmen of the nineteenth century. It may even be said that, in our own time, none of the liberal professions have been adorned by the display of superior, or perhaps equal, intellectual power, learning, eloquence, and devotion to their public duties. Cardinal Newman, a son —though a recreant son—of the Anglican Church; in learning, Thirlwall, Pusey, and Lightfoot; in eloquence, Wilberforce, Magee, and Liddon; in liberality, Arnold and Arthur Stanley; in statesmanlike care for the welfare of the National Church, Archibald Campbell Tait, were all men who, with wide divergencies of temperament, character, and opinion, were equally distinguished by their piety, their zeal, and their capacity.

Two of these eminent prelates—Cardinal Newman and Archbishop Tait—whose biographies are now before the world, present, in the most acute form, the contrast between two opposite series of causes and effects, which may operate in the diversity of religious life. The types of Christian excellence, which they offered, were widely different. To enrich the religious lifeblood of the nation neither could well be spared; but it was well for the country that Tait set over against the ecclesiastical type presented by Newman a broader type, which commended itself to the laity of England as deserving of the highest reverence. In the one the ecclesiastical, in the other the lay, mind instinctively sought its ideal. The one was a man of genius, the other a man of marked character. To the one the inward spiritual life, to the other outward practical activity, was the natural sphere of religious energy. The one was bent on things within, the other on things without. The one was steeped in the ecclesiasticism of the middle ages; the other evinced no sympathy with their ideals. The one was opposed to the progressive movements of the day, and regarded liberalism as synonymous with infidelity; the other was careful to study the spirit of the age, anxious to guide rather than thwart its expression, desirous, above all else, to liberalise the Church and its institutions, to harmonise the differences

which made religious men deficient in liberality, and liberal men lacking in religion, and, in a word, to create a deeply religious liberal party. The one left on the Church a doctrinal impression which is practically indelible; the other, regarding common sense and reality as the permanent virtues alike of religious and worldly affairs, moulded characters rather than shaped opinions. The subtle mind of the one excelled in dialectical refinements; the plain downright sense of the other was even deficient in some of the mental faculties which are regarded as the heritage of the Scottish race. The hold upon the nation of the one depended on his speculative, of the other on his practical, gifts. The one was a man of the past, or possibly of the future; the other essentially a man of to-day. The one took his stand upon the ancient ways, and endeavoured to mould church life to primitive models; the other was ceaselessly anxious to organise fresh improvements in the working system which should meet the wants of new conditions. The one was steeped in traditions, the other imbued with a sense of present needs. The one grappled with the mental difficulties of sensitive susceptible minds; the other passed them by to grasp firmly the practical necessities of the times. The one was, even unconsciously and against his will, a party leader, and, living in seclusion among men of kindred sympathies, developed the qualities of an advocate. The other yielded to no division or sect a partisan allegiance, and, in the administration of his responsible office, attained a degree of judicial impartiality, which, in a man of his intellectual eminence and decided views, was very remarkable. The nature of the one readily responded to every touch of spiritual, poetical, mystical, or ideal emotion; the temperament of the other, though for other men he did not deny the value of such impressions, was almost impervious to their influence, and with small inclination for the romance of history, with no passion for poetry, without imaginative fervour, and little taste for the Platonic philosophy, recoiled from everything that was vague, undefined, or mystical. The ideal of the one, absorbed as he was in exploring the mysteries of human nature and analysing the growth of moods of faith or of doubt, was the highest type of the mediæval monk. The ideal of the second was the practical active life of a Christian statesman, who seeks so to govern the Church that it may serve to the utmost in the great combat against the foes of faith, morals, and established order. The one, after long internal conflict, relapsed into

a dreamy mediævalism and passive submission to Rome, withdrawing from the cares of the Church or of the world, living in seclusion with a small band of friends and followers, and exercising over the opinions of his generation a purely ideal influence by means of his writings and discourses. The other, less learned, less subtle, less versed in archaic theology, less daring, and therefore less full of inspiration to others, dedicated himself to the study of the pressing wants of his age, and, regarding them from the nineteenth-century standpoint, plunged with his whole strength into the administrative duties of his office, seeking with all his energies to enlarge the limits of the Church, to make it less sectarian and more national, to give it a more active and beneficent share in the best interests at once of the private life of society and of the public life of the nation.

Newman's religious life reads like a romance of chivalry, while Tait's is sober prose. Their respective careers bring out, with striking vividness, the contrast between the Christian life of the world and of the cloister, of the man of action and the man of thought. Tait's life is a stupendous record of indefatigable labour, bestowed on practical affairs. Yet, compared with the picturesque figure of the late Cardinal, that of the late Archbishop seems almost dully commonplace. Popular interest always fastens most eagerly on the fiery champions of change, or the immoveable defenders of ancient ways, who play conspicuous parts in contemporary battles. It is reserved for later history to do complete justice to the men of calm strength and temperate wisdom, whose weighty counsels allay the storms that more impetuous leaders so often raise. The position of tolerant impartiality, which Tait adopted alike towards rationalism and ritualism, necessarily threw him into the background of the conflict. Yet, looking back upon the struggle in the light of subsequent events, it is impossible to exaggerate either the inestimable value of his broad sympathies to both Church and State, or the inevitable dangers which would have threatened both, had he, as Bishop of London or Archbishop of Canterbury, adopted a more intolerant or one-sided attitude. The position that Tait adopted towards religious controversies led to widespread misconceptions of his real character and opinions. His toleration was represented as the result of his own indefinite opinions, his moderating influence as the fruit of his own unenthusiastic temperament, his breadth of sympathy as the outcome of a cold-blooded disregard of the religious questions in dispute. No

one can lay down the admirable volumes in which his personal, as well as his official, character is depicted, without feeling that such partial views of the late Archbishop are entirely based on a misunderstanding.

The career of Archibald Campbell Tait was one of singular good fortune and uniform undeviating success. But there is another side to his story, which is full of almost tragic pathos. The shadow of trouble never left his home from the time when he was Dean of Carlisle. The memoirs of 'Catharine and Craufurd Tait' reveal in him unsuspected depths of love and tenderness, and prove him to have been endowed with that capacity for suffering which only belongs to rich natures. To the tragic events which chequered the brightness of his active career we shall scarcely allude. They are only mentioned here because the manly fortitude with which he bore a series of crushing bereavements illustrates, from another side, the deep reality of the spiritual convictions which sustained his courage, animated his life, and supplied the spring of all his energies. If he never magnified any peculiar view of scriptural truth into an article of Christian faith, if he never troubled men with the dry bones of departed controversies, if he did not waste his energies on the outward shell of Christianity, or labour to approve himself to this or that theological school, it was because he was himself convinced that there is a Christianity far wider and more loving than that which the spirit of party knows, because he occupied his mind with the great Gospel verities in their eternal simplicity, because he clung as for dear life to the Divinity of our Lord, and pressed upon others, as upon himself, His pure and simple Word as the essence and the reality of the Christian faith. The trials of life had made him more considerate, more tolerant, more sympathising. They also convinced him of the priceless value of the truths which had proved his only stay in terrible emergencies. No man was more profoundly convinced of the great realities proclaimed by the Gospel; very few had learned to love them through a severer test of their value to his own spirit. In his intense personal appreciation of the supreme efficacy of the elementary truths of Christianity, and in his deep sense of the relative insignificance of points of religious controversy, were based his hopes of the future of the National Church, his breadth of sympathy, his large-minded liberality. To the same causes is due his love of missionary enterprise, whether at home or abroad. Face to face with the practical heathenism

of London, or with the ignorance of savage nations, men forgot their controversial differences, and remembered only the central truths it was their mission to deliver. The misunderstandings which prevailed as to the personal character of Archbishop Tait justify the biographers in what probably will repel many readers of the life—the copious extracts from his private devotional journals. The reality of his personal religion was, in fact, the basis of his life. It was the source of his remarkable largeness of heart. If once he believed that a man held 'the Head which is Christ,' minor divergencies of opinion never chilled his affections. Such differences might inevitably impair sympathy; they could not destroy friendships. With two of his old Oxford associates, who subsequently became Roman Catholics, he maintained a lifelong intimacy. The same generosity of character, added to a sincere respect and love for goodness, wherever and however it was manifested, led him to appreciate the high unselfish aims of Newman, and to be something more than tolerant of individual Ritualists, whose zeal and earnestness he had learned to value. Few men retained throughout life so many friends whose opinions diverged so widely from his own. He was placed in a position where his conduct was necessarily blamed, however he acted, and many men differed from him in his estimate of the nature, the powers, the functions of the Church, or desired a bolder assertion of its claims, and a more uncompromising defence of its doctrines. But yet it remains true that the world has heard much of Tait's friendships, and nothing at all of his enmities.

The life of Archbishop Tait falls conveniently into six periods. The first includes his childhood, boyhood, and undergraduate career at Oxford (1811–34). To the second belongs his tutorial life at Balliol (1834–42); to the third his headmastership of Rugby (1842–50). In the fourth period (1850–56) he was Dean of Carlisle; in the fifth (1856–68) Bishop of London; in the sixth (1868–82) Archbishop of Canterbury.

Craufurd Tait, the father of the future Archbishop, was the son of John Tait, a successful Writer to the Signet. The Taits came of a good stock of 'bonnet lairds'—the Taits of Ludquharn in Aberdeenshire—who had been for generations staunch supporters of the Episcopalian Church. John Tait became a Presbyterian, and into the Established Church of Scotland both his son Craufurd and his grandson Archibald Campbell were baptised. Thus the future Arch-

bishop of Canterbury was by ancestry and tradition a Scotch Episcopalian, leavened by a streak of the Presbyterianism of two generations.

Craufurd Tait married Susan, the daughter of Sir Ilay Campbell, Lord President of the Court of Session. Their ninth child, Archibald Campbell, was born in 1811. Three years after his birth his mother died, and the care of the child, who was born club-footed, devolved on his two elder sisters, and on his nurse, Betty Morton, who played an all-important part in his early life. A severe Sabbatarian, and sternly setting her face against all Sunday amusements, her nursery *régime* was strict. In 1818 she accompanied Archibald to Whitworth in Lancashire, where the boy was placed under the care of James Taylor, whose fame was widespread for the cures which he effected in broken and twisted limbs. Under the care of this extraordinary man, of whose methods the 'Life' gives a graphic and picturesque account, he gradually gained the full use of his feet. From Whitworth he passed, in 1821, to the Edinburgh High School, and thence, in 1824, to the newly founded Academy, then under the rule of John Williams, Archdeacon of Cardigan, whose Homeric studies and labours in the cause of Welsh education are not forgotten by scholars or his countrymen. The Academy was a day school only, the boys living at home with their parents or boarding out in Edinburgh families. The hours of study were extraordinarily severe. Six hours' continuous work by day, and nearly as many more by night, left little time for amusement. In spite of one serious disadvantage, Tait rose rapidly to the head of the school. The sons of richer parents obtained the aid of private tutors; his only help in learning his lessons was Betty Morton.

'She used,' writes Lady Wake, the Archbishop's sister, 'to hold the Latin books close to her eyes, diligently following each word as he repeated page after page. "Ay, it maun be richt; it's just word for word, and it sounds like it," was his encouragement; or else a sudden lowering of the book, with "Na, na; it's no' that ava'," would warn him that he was wrong.'

The Academy then numbered between four and five hundred boys. It was, therefore, no slight feat for a delicate boy, handicapped by the want of a private tutor, to reach the top of the school. In 1827, the pale-faced, serious-minded 'Dux' was addressed by Lord Cockburn in a speech, long remembered for its tone of earnest eloquence, which concluded with the words, 'Go forth, young man, and re-

'member that wherever you go, the eyes of your country 'are upon you.'

From the Academy Tait went, in 1827, to Glasgow University. Here, again, he was accompanied by Betty Morton, who not only tended him with motherly care, but inexorably repulsed his friends from his door, when they sought to intrude upon his hours of study. At the University he carried all before him, and yet found time to edit a successful periodical, the 'College Album,' and to achieve a reputation as a strenuous debater on the Tory side. In 1830, he was elected to the Snell Exhibition at Balliol College, Oxford. Without this assistance he could not have afforded the expense of an education in the English University. The Snell Exhibition was originally founded for the benefit of Scotch Episcopalians. Subsequently it passed into the hands of the Presbyterian University of Glasgow. It is a curious illustration of the unconscious irony of history, that the scholar, thus sent to Oxford by the Presbyterian College, should live to become Archbishop of Canterbury.

During the early years of Tait's life, his religious teaching had mainly consisted of the desultory unprofessional teaching of his two sisters and his nurse. Both his schools were day schools, and neither at them, nor at the University, did he receive regular religious instruction. The atmosphere of his home life, as well as of his college, was Presbyterian. It was through his cousin, Ramsay Campbell, that he was brought under the influence of the so-called 'English 'Church.' No sooner had he reached Balliol than he applied to his tutor, Moberly, whom he afterwards consecrated Bishop of Salisbury, to be prepared as a candidate for confirmation, and was confirmed by the Bishop of Oxford. At Balliol, where he was shortly afterwards elected a scholar, he threw himself into the usual occupations and society of his contemporaries. A hard-working undergraduate, he was little known outside the walls of the college, except as a fiery and impetuous speaker. His early Toryism had passed away. In the Union, of which he became president in 1833, he defended Catholic Emancipation and the Reform Bill of 1832, and proposed 'concurrent 'endowment,' a principle to which he adhered throughout life, for the Roman Catholic priesthood in Ireland.

In 1833 he obtained his first class in the final classical schools and took his degree. The year before, he had lost his father, to whom he was devotedly attached. At the end

of 1833, the oldest and dearest friend of his childhood and youth, Betty Morton, died. During her illness Tait was with her constantly. The scene at her deathbed gives the first hint of the depth of tenderness which underlay the somewhat stern exterior of the Archbishop, and, as such, the passage in which it is recorded in the 'Life' is worth quoting:—

'He never left her side, except once, when he went to obtain the aid of Mr. Craig, a clergyman of the Scottish Episcopal Church, in order that the old nurse and her grown-up charge might together receive the Holy Communion, which at that time was rarely, if ever, administered privately in the Presbyterian Church, of which Betty was so staunch an adherent. When the Holy Communion had been celebrated, Mr. Craig left the two alone together. All night the young man sat by the old nurse's bed, and spoke to her words of peace and comfort as she was able to bear it. She died with her hand clasped in his as the morning broke on the first day of 1834.'

In November, 1834, Tait was elected a fellow of Balliol, his colleague being William George Ward, who had not yet at that time fallen under the spell of J. H. Newman. He threw himself into his new duties with characteristic vigour, and a year later he succeeded Moberly, who had been appointed Headmaster of Winchester, as tutor of the College. Among his early pupils were Dean Stanley, Bishop Waldegrave, Dean Goulburn, Dean Lake, Professor Jowett, Vice-Chancellor Wickens, Lord Chief Justice Coleridge, Arthur Clough, Bishop Temple, Sir Stafford Northcote, and Matthew Arnold. The life of a college tutor is a busy one; yet Tait kept his eyes steadily fixed on his ordination, and the rough journal, in which he jotted down his devotional thoughts, proves the extent to which the solemn prospect occupied his mind. Ordained in 1836, he was at once licensed to the curacy of Baldon, a straggling country parish, five miles from Oxford, without a vicarage house or a salary, with two churches, both in bad repair, and without a resident clergyman. Practically the sole care of the parish devolved upon him. He established a Sunday-school, trained a village choir, rode or walked out from Oxford several times a week, and generally slept in a hired cottage on Saturday night, that he might perform the Sunday service, from which he returned to the College Chapel. The assumption of such a charge, in addition to his tutorial duties, is a remarkable illustration of the keen sense of the responsibility of the pastoral office, which always characterised his clerical life. The experience which he gained in his country cure proved

invaluable to him in after life, when he was inaugurating missionary work in his London diocese. Nor was he content with thus discharging his responsibilities as a clergyman. He was always on the watch to establish a pastoral relation between himself and his pupils, and he organised and undertook the weekly religious instruction of the college servants within the walls of Balliol.

In the midst of this busy life, the chair of Moral Philosophy, and, subsequently of Greek, fell vacant at Glasgow University. The large emoluments, and the importance of the latter position, together with his affection for his old University, impelled him to become a candidate for the Greek professorship. 'I should like, of all things,' he says, 'to succeed poor Sandford,' or, again, 'I should be proud, 'indeed to return to my old university as a professor.' He was, however, at once confronted by a religious difficulty. A declaration was required from professors, which he felt he could not conscientiously make. Many men regarded the declaration as a mere form. But he could not accept the Calvinism to which it pledged him, and he withdrew from his candidature. The point is important, and characteristic. It was a question of the plain meaning of words, and he could not regard the taking of an oath as a mere form. It is the same feeling which actuated his protest against Tract XC., which impelled him to pronounce against the oath that it was intended to impose on the University in reference to Ward's case, and which led to his effort, as a member of the University Commission, to abolish the number of useless oaths which were exacted from graduates. This episode of the professorship ended, he devoted himself once more to the work of his tutorship. Always interested in foreign politics and foreign travel, he formed a plan which was afterwards fraught with important consequences. He took up his residence at Bonn, and made himself a thorough master of the German system of education. The knowledge which he now acquired of continental methods of instruction was afterwards embodied in a pamphlet on University Educational Reform, published in 1839, which practically secured him his place on the University Commission of 1852.

Tait was now a power, not only in Balliol, where he acted as prime minister to the constitutional monarchy of Dr. Jenkyns, but in the university. His vigour, acuteness, solidity of thought, and felicity of language made him one of the ablest lecturers of the day. The undergraduates

respected his manliness, good sense, straightforward simplicity, and found that they could not take advantage of his shrewdness and dry humour. Those of his pupils who knew him better, and penetrated the stiffness and reserve of his manner, found in him a warmth of heart and a genuine kindness of disposition, which secured him their lifelong affection. But it was not only into the purely intellectual life of the university, or even into the pastoral work which he had created for himself, that Tait threw himself. His diaries show that he was a close student of Newman's sermons, and a critical observer of the developement of his teaching. His own opinions were markedly opposed to those of the Tractarians. In 1838 he had characterised their system as most dangerous and superstitious. Nor was this judgement based on hasty prejudice. It was a deliberate opinion, formed on careful study of the Tractarian writings, and confirmed by frequent discussions with Oakeley and with Ward. No man in Oxford was less attracted to the movement. To his Scotch birth and education and Whig principles it was entirely antipathetic. The romantic charm which surrounded its leaders did not attract him. His lack of poetic feeling, his want of ecclesiastical sympathies, his deficiency of imaginative power, raised up a barrier between him and Newmanism. At the same time his downright common-sense and practical clearness of vision detected the Romeward tendencies of Tractarianism, which were concealed from men who fell more directly under the spell of its leader.

In his attitude towards the great movement which enthralled Oxford, Tait stood almost alone. The heads of houses and a few college tutors regarded with suspicion or dislike the new ecclesiastical departure. But all the most active and capable men had fallen under its fascination, and more or less yielded to it their adhesion. Tait was almost the only man of powerful intellect and high moral tone who resisted the strength of the current. When Tract XC. appeared, Tait showed that he had the courage of his opinions, and did not fear to brave unpopularity in the university by openly declaring his opposition. He was one of the four tutors who protested against the tract, and the letter to the 'Times,' which contained their once famous protest, was drafted by his hand. Whatever may be said against the wisdom of the step, no one can doubt that the letter was a calm and reasonable document, giving expression to fears which subsequent events proved to be

well founded. How general was the alarm excited by the Tracts is proved by the reception accorded to the protest. The fuel had long been prepared; the protest of the tutors only set to it the match. Nor can there be any question of the courage which such a step required in the University of Oxford, where all that was best and most generous was arrayed on the side of the Tractarians. The protest once made, Tait retired from the controversy. The discussion of theological subtleties was not to his taste, and he had protested rather against what he considered to be a disingenuous method of treating formularies than against any doctrinal innovations in the teaching of the new school.

On Sunday, June 12, 1842, Dr. Arnold died at Rugby. Ten days later Tait, mainly at the instigation of Stanley and Lake, offered himself as a candidate for the vacant headmastership. At the age of thirty-one he was elected. For anyone to wear the giant's armour was difficult; the position was conspicuous and hazardous; the standard, by which success or failure was to be measured, was perilously high. But Tait laboured under exceptional disadvantages. It seemed a dubious experiment to appoint as headmaster a young Scotchman, of Presbyterian extraction, who had not yet cast off his natural stiffness of address, and who had never himself been at an English public school. Deficient in scholarship, less in sympathy with boys than with men, and wanting in power as a preacher, he was suddenly called to preside over a staff of able masters, trained under the eye of the greatest headmaster of the century, and to wield authority over several hundred boys, who were steeped in traditions of which Tait necessarily knew nothing, and who were little disposed to regard him as the equal of his predecessor. On the other hand, his administrative power had been tested as tutor and dean of Balliol, and, in his dealings with young men, he had shown a combination of tact and knowledge of the world, which is rare within the walls of colleges. It was almost universally felt that the appointment was the best that could be made.

Tait's tenure of the headmastership of Rugby was one of the most trying and difficult periods of his life. His excellent good sense, indefatigable industry, earnestness, and disregard of personal ease earned him the respect both of masters and of boys, and enabled him to fill with credit a post for which he was not specially designed. For his own growth the period was extremely valuable. It immensely developed his tact, courtesy, and respect for the feelings of

others. It fostered that power of dealing with and governing men, in which he subsequently excelled. Much of the success which he attained at Rugby must be attributed to his marriage with Catharine Spooner in 1843. Among the many ways in which he gained by the singular happiness of his married life, none was more immediately conspicuous than the relations into which he was brought with prominent High Churchmen, and the effect which this personal intercourse produced upon his views of their position.

Tait's work at Rugby was interrupted by the dangerous illness which led to his acceptance of the deanery of Carlisle in 1850. Before he left Rugby the masters had learned to recognise the loss they would sustain by his removal, and the boys had come to regard with warm affection the dignified, courteous gentleman, whose kindly humour and occasional gleams of deep emotion revealed the reserve of strength and feeling which underlay the cold exterior. In one respect he left the school better than he found it. Rugby, under Arnold, bred many prigs. To this result the monitorial system had, in its initiation, greatly contributed. It encouraged the self-importance of sixth-form boys, to the injury of their characters and the straining of their relations with the school. Tait regulated the powers of these boy-masters, abolished certain of their privileges, and, by so doing, established more easy relations between the monitors and the boys, to the advantage of both. Throughout his whole rule the same characteristics prevailed. He was content to work on the old lines, and to curb the extravagances to which the system lent itself. He checked the tendency to plunge prematurely into religious and political controversy, repressed the enthusiasms which strained after precocious effect, and, alike in teaching, sermons, and government, endeavoured to restore the naturalness, simplicity, and unconsciousness of boyhood, which were imperilled in the stimulating atmosphere of Rugby life.

When Tait accepted the deanery of Carlisle in 1850, he took it as an easy post for a man whose health was broken. It was supposed that his work was done. But he soon showed that he had no intention of dozing on the decanal cushion. At Rugby he had been content to develope the policy of his predecessor; at Carlisle, he struck out a new line for himself. He proved that the office of a dean in a Cathedral city may be made the instrument of varied usefulness, if only a man has the courage and the energy to eman-

cipate himself from traditions of inactivity. When he was a tutor at Balliol, he had pondered on the best means to enable the poorer classes to profit by the university, and he had himself undertaken the provision of religious instruction for the college servants. As Dean of Carlisle, he threw himself into his local duties in the same spirit, and with the same keen sense of his personal responsibilities. In a short time, he had, in spite of great obstruction, regulated the duties of the minor canons, arranged the attendances of the bedesmen, established an evening service for the working classes, and provided a daily service, for which he made himself individually responsible. He restored the fabric of the Cathedral, reorganised the capitular revenues under the scheme of the Act of 1851, placed the public charities of the town on a sounder financial footing, and revived the efficiency of the local schools. Under his rule the Cathedral became the place of popular worship, and the deanery the centre of active religious work, at which night-schools, mothers' meetings, and lectures constantly were held. Besides his official work as dean, he was assiduous in visiting the sick and dying, and united the offices of a cathedral dignitary with those of workhouse chaplain and parish clergyman.

But the most prominent public work in which he was engaged while at Carlisle was the University Commission of 1852. That Commission was denounced as a dangerous departure of modern liberalism. It was vehemently opposed. Letters from all parts of the country poured in, protesting against its appointment; the visitors and the colleges prepared for resistance. Tait had already been invited to accept a place upon the Commission, and if Lord John Russell hesitated to carry out his plans, his courage was revived by a strenuous letter from Tait urging him to stand to his guns. Throughout the Commission, the Dean of Carlisle took a prominent part. His hand drafted the memorandum in reply to the legal opinion of counsel on the illegality of the Commission. The final report, and above all the practical recommendations, were mainly his work. These last are so characteristic of the author's mind that they merit passing attention. Speaking generally, their object was to popularise Oxford, on the one hand by giving to the university a representative constitution, on the other by throwing open its education to a poorer class of students. A relaxation of the obligations of Fellows to take Holy Orders, the removal of restrictive conditions which fettered the

candidature for the prizes of the university, the abolition of artificial distinctions of rank and wealth, and the admission of a large number of unattached students, were among the reforms which the Commissioners most strenuously advocated.

Tait's vigorous handling of the thorny question of the University Commission, his liberal sympathies, and the influence of Lord Shaftesbury, plainly marked him out for preferment in the Church. The tragic illness at the Carlisle Deanery, the death of his five children, and the universal sympathy which it aroused, accelerated the promotion which was otherwise certain. In Tait's diary occurs the following entry:—

'Hallsteads, *Thursday, 8th May*, 1856.—I have not had the heart to make any entry in my journal now for nine weeks. When last I wrote I had six daughters on earth; now I have one—an infant. O God, Thou hast dealt very mysteriously with us. We have been passing through deep waters; our feet were well-nigh gone. But though Thou slay us, yet will we trust in Thee.'

Upon grief like that of the parents, it would be impossible to intrude. The trial, through which Tait passed, softened the natural eagerness of his disposition, deepened the lines of tenderness and religious conviction, and established for him a peculiar claim upon the support of the clergy in the great diocese over which he was shortly called to preside. All his subsequent life he lived under the solemnising shadow of a crushing sorrow. He had hardly recommenced his work as Dean, when he was offered by Lord Palmerston, and at once accepted, the Bishopric of London.

It was a bold experiment on the part of the Government to appoint to so responsible and independent a position as the See of London a man who had so little technical experience in the duties of a bishop. It required no little courage on the part of Dr. Tait to accept the charge. Of episcopal work he knew nothing; of the general ordering of Church affairs he was ignorant; he had never sat in Convocation, had rarely attended a clerical meeting, was unknown on religious platforms, enjoyed no reputation either as a preacher or as a public speaker, and laboured under the suspicion of his Presbyterian birth and training. Of strictly pastoral duties he had considerable experience, which he had gained as curate of Baldon, as tutor of Balliol, as headmaster of Rugby, and as Dean of Carlisle. But there seemed little in his past career to justify his promotion to the largest diocese in the world, and as the successor of Bishop Blomfield, whose

vigour, sagacity, eloquence, wit, and business capacity had revolutionised men's views of the English Episcopate. Yet there were advantages in the appointment which went far to compensate these adverse conditions. In the first place Tait belonged to no sect within the Church; he owned no partisan allegiance; party watchwords were never on his lips. All that was definitely known about his views was that he was not an Oxford High Churchman. In the second place, acknowledging no leader on the bench of bishops, he was compelled to strike out a new line for himself. He found it where many of his predecessors had failed to seek it. He devoted himself to the people who had no church, rather than to those who were contending for the victory of High Church or Low Church. Both extreme parties found cause to complain of him; and in this unanimity of complaint lay his title to the respect and gratitude of moderate men. But from the very first he concentrated his attention on the problem which had exercised his mind at Oxford and at Carlisle, of popularising the Church in London. His very first sermon strikes the keynote of his episcopate—the provision of better means of bringing the Gospel home to the poor.

The two characteristics of Tait's episcopate are his balanced judgement on ritualism and rationalism, and his strenuous attempt to relieve the spiritual destitution of the metropolis. Combined with these, and summarising both, was his conception of the National Church, and, as a consequence, his persistent effort to give it a broad, comprehensive, national basis—on the one side by toleration of divergencies of opinion, on the other by increasing not only the moral and spiritual efficiency of the Church, but by working out through its means the social, physical, and intellectual elevation of the people. This last feature became increasingly prominent in the last years of his episcopate, and reached its fullest developement in his primacy. The ritual troubles which again and again broke out from 1856 to 1868, the controversy which raged over 'Essays and 'Reviews,' the difficulties that perplexed the colonial churches, the strife of which Bishop Colenso was the centre, —all these are matters of ephemeral interest, far less enduring and permanent in importance than the relief of spiritual wants in which he engaged the sympathy and aid of the laity of the wealthiest city in the world. Yet though at this stage we do not propose to dwell at length either on his general conception of the work of the Church, or on the

controversial disputes of 1856–68, something must be said to explain his attitude towards the polemical strife which raged around him. In his first charge he recognises the danger which might arise, alike from those who carried their love of external worship to extremes, and from those who regarded every maxim of theology or philosophy as an open question. He was in fact called to the See of London at the moment when the reaction against Tractarianism bore fruit in the works of men like Bishop Colenso, Mr. Wilson, or Professor Baden Powell, and when the reaction against the Gorham judgement produced a tendency among even moderate High Churchmen to exaggerate the ritual rites and observances which symbolised high sacramental doctrines. Towards both parties Tait's attitude was one of studious moderation and scrupulous impartiality. Yet though he was one of the two bishops who voted against the synodical condemnation of 'Essays and Reviews,' he always regarded rationalism as a more dangerous foe to religion than the wildest extravagances of ritualism. The subject is one which will be more appropriately discussed at a later stage. As Bishop of London, his position was rather that of a leader than of a governor, and the battle which he fought was not one of ceremonies, vestments, and ornaments, but of religion against irreligion—not of articles of abstract belief, but of morality and order against immorality and vice.

Tait possessed a rare power of penetrating to the kernel of a position, of seeing what most required to be done, and of doing it quietly, unobtrusively, energetically. He felt that in London he held the citadel of the National Church, and that if London could be made the Christian centre of the nation, the national Christianity would derive from the metropolitan nucleus a new and surprising vigour. To London flowed a steady tide of the best intellects and brains of the country; from London again poured the stream of influence to the remotest districts of England. If London were once evangelised, the religious life of the nation would receive a new youth. But a large proportion of the population was living in practical heathenism. The steady influx of the poorer classes was accompanied by the steady efflux of the rich. Streets of small houses rose by magic; public-houses multiplied themselves; seething alleys sprang up, in which no man of rank or education was qualified to look after the accumulated masses. The Church organisation was paralysed by numbers, and by the mass of misery and vice by which it was surrounded. It could no longer conduct the

attack; it was scarcely able to maintain the defence against vice and infidelity.

To reorganise the Church, and to enable it to resume an aggressive attitude, was the work into which Tait threw his vast energies and great administrative abilities. Regarding the Church as the inheritance of the poor, and firmly convinced that its great peril was standing still, he determined not to wait till the people came to the Gospel, but to carry the Gospel to the people. He threw episcopal etiquette to the winds, and did not shrink from the sneers which were levelled at his undignified or Methodist proceedings. He was not afraid to undertake work which it was the fashion to depute to the 'inferior clergy.' No Whitfield or Wesley could have laboured with greater zeal among the people. Intent on popularising the Church, he began, though without sacrifice of his great native dignity, to popularise the office of a bishop. He himself set the example to his clergy of breaking through the routine which cramped their energies. He saved the Church from the danger that she might die of her dignity. He let it be clearly understood that, as he himself said, 'its true dignity consisted in 'its doing, in every proper way, after Christ's example, 'Christ's work.' Whether or not he was justly accused of neglecting the governing duties of his office for evangelistic work, is a question which is comparatively immaterial when it is remembered that he was the first bishop, unless Wilberforce, working on widely different lines, be counted as his precursor, who popularised the episcopal office, and taught the world that a great bishop may yet be a factor in the practical daily life of the nineteenth century.

Already under Bishop Blomfield the work had been begun of building new churches to grapple with the gigantic increase of London. Two hundred new churches had been consecrated in the episcopate of Tait's predecessor. But beyond this Blomfield's energies had not passed. He never preached, except once, extempore; he did not encourage week-day services; he favoured no new evangelistic agencies; he viewed with suspicion ministrations outside the walls of churches. In 1856, not only were many new churches needed, but many of the existing edifices were standing empty. The churches stood like garrisons in a conquered land; the people withdrew to their remoter fastnesses, and remained estranged and unsubdued. Tait saw that not only new churches, but new agencies, were required, and that the erection of a church was not the spread of the Gospel. He

threw himself into the work with characteristic vigour. He set the example of open-air preaching; now speaking to railway porters from the platform of a locomotive, now addressing a colony of gipsies upon the common at Shepherd's Bush, now preaching to the costermongers in Covent Garden market, or to the omnibus drivers at their yard in Islington. He sanctioned the Exeter Hall meetings for persons unaccustomed to church-going, and was himself present at one of the services. His influence opened Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's for similar Sunday services. He inaugurated a series of evening services in North and East London. He organised the Diocesan Home Mission, the first organisation of its kind, which arranged for periodical special services, and employed a number of clergy for evangelistic work in crowded districts. The services in theatres, which were begun in November 1859, received his sympathy as an experiment to which he was anxious to give a fair trial. Unremitting in his attempts to promote missionary effort, recognising that London forms a world in itself, and that its schemes of Christian usefulness must suit all tastes, he was ready to avail himself of the sympathy and help of every sort of fellow-labourer, and he favoured every exertion, honestly made, to advance the Church's means of gaining human souls.

The noble enterprise in which Tait was engaged culminated in the creation of the Bishop of London's Fund, which owed its existence to his exertions, and which seemed to open up a new future for the capital. The busy world of the metropolis, in the midst of its absorbing occupations and luxurious habits, was deeply stirred; its conscience was roused to recognise a great need; and the interest thus awakened was maintained until it had produced permanent results. Tait took advantage of the right moment. He well knew that a period when all the rights were claimed for one side, and all the responsibilities assigned to the other, was not a time for the Church to appeal to the State for aid. Feeling that no parliamentary assistance was possible for the spiritual destitution of the metropolis, he convoked a great meeting of landowners and employers of labour at London House in 1863. He followed up the meeting by a stirring appeal to the public, in which he emphasised the dangers to the whole social system that might arise from demoralised masses of population, and the paramount duty which lay upon every man to assist in leavening them with a civilising Christian influence. He succeeded in his purpose. It is no

slight testimony to the confidence which he had inspired that, during years when the ecclesiastical world was rent by the controversy of 'Essays and Reviews,' he should have raised a million and a half of money, to be expended in adding an army of clergymen, scripture readers, and mission women to the permanent working staff of the diocese.

The labours which we have briefly summarised were achieved in addition to the discharge of other varied duties. Tait found time to make his presence felt in the remotest parts of London, to promote by liberal hospitality a kindly social intercourse among his clergy, to influence public opinion, whether in legislation, society, or theology, to prove himself a successful leader of the energies of both the clergy and the laity, to conduct a voluminous correspondence, to keep in touch with the course of domestic and foreign politics, and all this without relaxation from the usual round of parochial activities, meetings, confirmations, sermons, committees, and attendances at the House of Lords or in Convocations. Nor were his literary labours slight. His elaborate and finished charges of 1858, 1862, 1866, were masterly contributions to the solution of many practical problems of church life, and inaugurated a new era in the style and subject of such episcopal utterances. Hitherto the charges of bishops had consisted, with few exceptions, of elaborate inanities, in which every subject that admitted of divergence of opinion was carefully avoided, or treated in vague generalities. Tait, on the other hand, had something to say, and was determined to say it. In his primary charge of 1858 which occupied five hours in delivery, in plain outspoken terms, he grappled closely with the difficulties of the day. It remains one of the greatest achievements of his life, and all London was for several days full of its praises. Portions of it were controversial, but their interest has almost passed away. On the other hand, the interest of the passages, in which Tait examines into the needs and difficulties of providing for the individual wants of London, retain their freshness and practical vitality at the present day. To popularise the Church in the metropolis was his first care. In the later years of his episcopate other subjects grew into new importance. In his three volumes of sermons, as well as in his two later diocesan charges, he boldly faced the points which were brought into dispute by Bishop Colenso and the authors of 'Essays and Reviews.' His language is neither timorous nor ambiguous; his own faith is

clear, definite, positive, and anyone who has hitherto believed the late Archbishop Tait to have been a man of vague or negative creed has only to read his plain outspoken words to find the depth, reality, and simplicity of his religious convictions on the cardinal points of Christianity.

Efforts so continuous and so exhausting told severely on his constitution. Anxiety concerning his health led him to hesitate whether or not to accept the Archbishopric of York, which was pressed upon him by Lord Palmerston in 1862. His decision to remain where he was was greeted with a chorus of approval. 'To give up London for York,' wrote Lady Wake, 'would have seemed to me like a man 'making a second marriage, while the first wife and family 'were not only yet living, but possessing all the husband's thoughts and affections.' He himself felt, as has been already said, that the command of London was the command of the citadel of the Church. Nothing but fear of the collapse of his physical strength would have made him leave the diocese, and, having once decided to remain where he was, he threw himself with all his former zest and earnestness into the busy life of his responsible position.

In 1868 Dr. Longley died. An interval of suspense, of very anxious suspense, ensued, and then Mr. Disraeli offered the Archbishopric of Canterbury to Dr. Tait. The offer was accepted, and the Bishop of London became the ninety-second occupant of the Chair of St. Augustine, the Primate of all England, and the chief subject in the realm. 'To be 'generally recognised as the fittest person to fill such a place 'at such a juncture is itself an honour higher than the 'dignity itself.' So wrote Bishop Thirlwall to the new Primate, and he added that, in his opinion, Tait was so recognised by all, except the extreme High Churchmen. As Archbishop of Canterbury, Tait necessarily passes from the active leader into the careful and prudent governor. In the See of London his administration was eminently successful; his personal example had infused new life into the whole Church; his administrative capacity had been tested by the skill with which he had reduced to order a diocese which was in a state of chaotic disorganisation; his personal devotion to his work had been evinced in many ways, and especially by his visits to the cholera wards of 1866. But as Metropolitan he was required to take a wider view of the interests of the Church than he had taken as a Diocesan. He had to make his influence felt not on a See, but on a Province; to direct a Church rather than invigorate a Diocese. Once more he

rose to the requirements of the office, and as Archbishop of Canterbury he stands by the side of Laud as the most distinguished of those prelates who have sat in the throne of St. Augustine since the Reformation.

Tait was called to the Primacy at a memorable crisis—a time of unrest and controversy, a period fruitful in vigorous thought and Church activity, fruitful also in ecclesiastical difficulties. It was an age of transition, and for such an age he was eminently qualified. It would be absurd to contend that he made no mistakes. But no man could have more successfully opposed the external foes of the Church, though others might, perhaps, have more sympathetically guided the great movement within the Church itself. In stemming and turning back the tide of Disestablishment, his calmness, strong judgement, determination, courtesy, and conciliation were invaluable. Probably no ecclesiastic ever exercised so wide an influence over the laity. He rallied them to the support of the Church, taught them to regard it, not as a clerical appanage, but as a national institution, placed it in a stronger position than it had previously occupied during the century, and made it impossible, during his lifetime, to attempt, with any prospect of success, to weaken the connexion between Church and State. In dealing with the Ritualist movement, his mistakes sprang from his early training. He did not sufficiently realise the part which the Church of Christ has played in the history of Christ's religion. He did not adequately emphasise the importance of the apostolic organisation which the Church of England inherits, and on which she bases her just claims; neither did he fully estimate the hold which the desire for the utmost attainable beauty of external worship had obtained over devout minds. Yet even here unprejudiced observers will admit that his rule was temperate and conciliatory, that his tolerance of divergencies of opinion was large-minded, and that his efforts were increasingly directed towards peace and comprehensive charity.

It would be tedious to examine in detail the career of Tait as Archbishop. Its history is recorded in the three charges of 1872, 1876, and 1880. We prefer to group our remarks under two heads, and to speak of his external and internal policy, in other words to discuss his attitude first towards the Church as a national institution, and secondly towards its intestine divisions.

Almost the earliest step of public importance which the new Archbishop was called upon to take was to vote upon

the question of the Disestablishment of the Irish Church. When Dr. Tait rose in the crowded assemblage which filled the House of Lords on Monday, June 14, 1869, the deep silence indicated the sense which the audience entertained of the vast responsibilities of the speaker. The Archbishop spoke slowly, clearly, calmly, and with telling force—with a gravity which befitted the occasion, and with a dignity that was worthy of his office. His speech carried the second reading of the Irish Church Bill. Had he thrown his weight into the opposite scale, the Bill would have been rejected. Then, as always, he took the matter-of-fact, the common-sense, the business-like view of the situation. He proposed to allow the Bill to be read a second time, and to endeavour to carry material amendments in committee. He had convinced himself that it was impossible to resist the expression of public opinion in favour of the Bill, or to thwart the immense majorities by which its details were carried in the Lower House. He believed that the rejection of the second reading of the Bill by a small majority, largely composed of bishops, would be disastrous to the Irish Church, and that the course he followed was the wisest policy for the Church of which he was the chief representative. Whether or not he sufficiently regarded disestablishment from the point of view of the Church, whether he sufficiently considered its claims or the sacrifices which the Bill enacted, has been hotly disputed. But there can be no doubt that the compromise which afterwards averted a collision between the two Houses was in a great measure due to his tact and moderation. Throughout the whole debate his attitude was consistently that of the statesman rather than of the ecclesiastic, and as such was characteristic of his external policy.

In 1856, when Dr. Tait was first called to the bench of bishops, the Church of England had reawakened from her torpor. Confirmed in her standard of orthodoxy, partially reorganised in her system, and restored to comparative financial prosperity, she was ministering faithfully to the spiritual hunger of human souls. But this revival was mainly on her religious and her material side. The first had been the work of a school which accentuated the antagonism between the Church and the world, ignored the intellectual, literary, and artistic sides of life, distrusted even the highest forms of secular activity, and concentrated its energies on making religion a personal, individual matter between each man and his God. The Church had lost her

comprehensiveness, abandoned her national claims, let slip her grasp on the educated classes and on social life. She was in danger of sinking into a sect—rich, useful, energetic, and powerful indeed—but isolated from kindred influences, and holding aloof from all forces of Christianity which did not distinctly belong to her own system. These conditions Tait, perhaps at first unconsciously, but afterwards designedly and of set purpose, laboured to remove. He discerned the drift of the age, and kept himself in harmony with its spirit. In the years that followed the disestablishment of the Irish Church he recognised that the Church in England could only be strengthened by commending itself to no narrow sect of Churchmen but to the sober judgement of the nation. His view of the true life of the Church was at once less ecclesiastical and more national, less individual and more comprehensive. He strove not only to increase the moral and spiritual efficiency of the Church, but to make it the instrument by which the tone of the whole nation should be raised, and by which the spirit of Christianity should be infused into the legislation, art, literature, and social life of England. He held that it was the duty of the Church to deal with the dangers which civilisation brought into its train and with civilisation itself; to follow and direct, rather than to thwart and repress, the course of events; to express and to guide the religious feelings of millions of intelligent men who were especially impatient of ecclesiastical control, and to be the truest witness to the world of an active-minded, progressive, zealous, and loving Christianity. It was, in his view, the task of the Church to resist entire absorption in the calls of religious ministrations and to devote a portion of her energies to influencing public opinion on every side, to identifying herself with all the best interests of the country, and, in a word, to making herself, in the widest and most comprehensive sense of the words, a National Church.

This was the conception of the life of the Church which appears in Tait's first episcopal charge, and which recurs with ever-increasing force in all his subsequent addresses, whether as Bishop of London or as Archbishop of Canterbury. In his view the life of the Established Church is national, its duties national, its responsibilities national. He did not, indeed, overlook the other side of Church life, or forget that the Church, as a Church, is an independent institution, relying on Christ's promise for its enduring stability, holding its commission direct from Christ's delega-

tion, deriving neither functions nor existence from the State or nation. As a Church its existence is permanent and secure. But the stability of the Established Church depended on the extent to which the nation acknowledged that its best interests were identified with those of the Church. He looked facts straight in the face, and from a nineteenth-century standpoint. He believed that the value of the Establishment was inestimable, and that without it the national life of the Church must be starved and stunted. He gloried in the privileges and opportunities of the Established Church; he could not conceive of a State doing perfectly its duty as a State without the guiding principle of religion; he thought that disestablishment meant the surrender of inherited advantages, the sacrifice of long-proved agencies for good, the abandonment of unique responsibilities, the destruction of a wealth of historical association. But he also saw that the retention of the advantages which flowed from the connexion between Church and State necessarily depended on the degree to which the Established Church justified her existence, retained the affection of the nation, answered to the test of practical utility, and represented with the greatest comprehensiveness the faith of England. As an establishment the Church must stand or fall by the merits of her system, by her diligent discharge of duties, by her full recognition of her responsibilities, by her capacity for meeting the varied needs of the day for strengthening the cause of order, and for advancing the best interests of the nation. The keynote of his episcopate was the care for the poor, of his primacy the nationalisation of the Church.

In this conception of the life of the Church, Tait may have exaggerated the value of the Establishment; he may have confounded the means with the end; he may have lost sight of the instrument in the work to which it was to be applied; he may have sacrificed too lightly the notes of the true Church to the necessities of the time. Such charges were, and still are, levelled against his Primacy. But we believe that he was as unyielding in the interests of vital truth as he was in minor matters open to compromise. And it must be remembered that it was this conception of the National Church, combined with the degree in which he not only realised it to himself but represented it to the world, and with the spirit which his example infused into the body of which he was the official representative, that gave him his remarkable influence over the laity, that enabled the Church

in England to weather the storm which shipwrecked the Irish establishment, and that placed the institution in a position of stability which it is very far from retaining at the present day. It was this conception which his Presbyterian training naturally suggested to him as of primary importance; it was also that which he was best qualified, alike by his gifts and his deficiencies, to realise in himself and to represent to the nation. Tolerant of differences, fair and just to opponents, broad in sentiment, comprehensive in charity, clear and cold in judgement, he was admirably fitted to forge the links between the Church and society, and to act as the moderator and mediator between the opponents and the advocates of ecclesiastical legislation. He united in himself the zeal of the ecclesiastic with the best characteristics of the man of the world. Never hasty, vehement, or exaggerated in his views, never a partisan or a hero-worshipper, he was not the man to be blinded by prejudices, or to sacrifice the material interests of the Church to lost causes. He allowed no private fancies or personal inclinations to assume undue proportions in his eyes. He did not impress his contemporaries as one born out of due time, as a man behind or in advance of his age, but as a man of his day. It was by nineteenth-century considerations that he judged circumstances; and it was one secret of his power that he could rise above ephemeral controversies and fix his eyes on the permanent centres of the Church's work and distinctive mission. Great in his purpose, there was no littleness in his actions, and nothing feeble in his character. Stripping every question of its unimportant details, discriminating the primary from the secondary circumstances, and going straight to the kernel of a subject, his powerful mind and large heart enabled him to take a broad view of every point that came before him. He dealt not with matters of passing significance, but with essential realities. Thus his counsels possessed a weight, his character a massiveness, and his utterances a structural strength, that gave to his opinions, as expressed in debate, their telling force and their enduring value. Dexterous in moulding conclusions into harmony with his own prepossessions, dignified in manner, ready of speech, keen, logical, incisive in language, endowed of great oratorical gifts, he yet mainly owed his influence in the House of Lords to this distinctive power. The feeling that whatever he said was a real contribution to the discussion, combined with his absolute integrity and robust common sense, gave him a hold upon that fastidious assembly which

he never lost till within the last few months of his life. And in another sphere it was this same power of reaching the heart of a subject, that enabled him in his addresses, charges, or other writings, to lay down in broad and solid outline the essential features of Christianity, on which his own faith firmly rested, and by which he hoped to realise his conception of a National Church.

It has been said that the nationalisation of the Church was the keynote of Tait's primacy. But in another, and even wider, view of Church life, he grasped the dignity of his position, and successfully appealed to the world to recognise the grandeur of the institution over which he presided. As Bishop of London he had regarded his diocese as the heart of the National Church of England. As Archbishop of Canterbury he learned to look upon the primacy as the core and centre of a still more extended organisation. To a degree remarkable in a man of his Presbyterian training and unimaginative temperament, he realised the fact that he was 'alterius orbis Papa.' Without a tinge of mediæval sympathies, he yet exalted his office in a manner which recalls the best elements in the Hildebrandine conception of the Papacy of the Middle Ages. By the Pan-Anglican Conference of 1878 he raised the Primacy into a Patriarchate, and restored to the Church of England a sense of her Catholicity by emphasising her position as the cradle of the vast Anglican communities which were scattered over the face of the globe.

Tait's conception of a National Church and of a Catholic Church united with his grasp of the essential unity of Christian truth and the natural bent of his balanced judicial mind to make his rule essentially tolerant. A National Church, which seeks to mould and influence a nation—a Catholic Church, which takes into consideration the wide differences of climate, civil government, and civilisation, that coexist in its component parts—must necessarily be tolerant of divergencies of opinion. No one could contemplate the Church in either capacity without being prepared for diversity in the midst of essential unity. Toleration was a necessity of his rule. Disliking the badges of party, refusing to utter its watchwords, he laboured less to inculcate the formal principles of an orthodox creed than to infuse a Christian spirit into the actions of daily life, alike into the private relations of society and the public affairs of the nation. He was broad in sympathies, not lax in opinions. His charity was a charity of the heart; but it implied no contempt for

dogma, still less any absence of decided theological convictions. A man of deep convictions, personal earnestness, and positive religious views, he always maintained a frank respect for the sincerity of those who differed from him on doctrinal points which are liable to human interpretation. His broad comprehensiveness of view—which smaller men might, and did, censure as latitudinarian—enabled him to extend his sympathies to every section or branch of the Established Church and, beyond its communion, to the Episcopal Church of Scotland, the Protestant Churches of the Continent, the ancient Churches of the East, as well as to cultivate friendly relations with Nonconformity, without compromising his own office or the position of the Church. All his great influence was thrown into the scale of judicial moderation. Always, whether in the House of Lords or in Convocation, he was the consistent advocate of toleration, the constant opponent of every harsh and irritating measure. In this spirit, on the one side, he strove to avert the synodical condemnation of 'Essays and Reviews,' or to allay the storm caused by the appointment of Dr. Temple to the bishopric of Exeter; and, on the other side, to restrain ritual prosecutions within his dioceses, or to find some loophole of escape which could set Mr. Green free from Lancaster Gaol. He held that the best men of the time disliked schools of theology. 'They desire a religion which shall serve them 'and their neighbours in life and death, without tying them 'up to unnatural phrases, or locking up their feet, whether 'they will or no, in the stocks of some antiquated system of 'discipline.' On this view he modelled his rule of the Church. Standing above, and outside of, transitory controversies, and never taking a side, he endeavoured to keep the Church—as he kept himself—above the pedantic exclusiveness of Church Unions and Church Associations.

The one apparent exception to this policy of toleration was the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874. 'How 'does it happen,' asked a distinguished American Churchman, in 1878, 'that the wisest and most respected of your 'bishops is the author of the most unpopular, ridiculous, 'and unworkable of modern Acts of Parliament?' No public act in the Archbishop's life has excited so much comment, none certainly has contributed more to misconceptions of his character, policy, and opinions. A brief examination, therefore, of the circumstances which preceded and accompanied the passing of the Act, is necessary to explain his attitude towards the Ritualist movement.

Tait, as we have already said, had no fear lest the country should relapse into semi-Romanism. He regarded the Ritual movement as the natural, and, in that aspect, healthy reaction against Rationalism. Superstition was not, in his opinion, the peril of Christianity. Scepticism was the enemy which the Church had to fear. The Archbishop was far less anxious to assail the so-called 'Catholic' party, whose mediæval conception of the Church had largely supplanted the Tractarian appeals to a primitive or apostolic organisation, than to wage war upon the tendency to deny the supernatural element of the Christian religion. He dreaded the inclination to give up the Incarnation and the Resurrection, to sublimate Christianity, to reduce it to a cold and powerless Deism, to substitute a great human benefactor for the Divine Saviour. These were the opinions against which he directed all the force of his intellect and character. Against these he brought to bear his most strenuous efforts. Throughout his whole career, from the moment that he was raised to the episcopal bench, this was the attitude which he consistently maintained towards the rationalising movement. Whatever influences were at work to secure his support to the Public Worship Act, it is only ignorance that can see in his share in the legislative enactment any symptoms of sympathy with a rationalised Church.

No man, again, could be more opposed than Tait to the maintenance of orthodoxy by legal compulsion. It was not to courts of law that the Church owed its stability, but to arguments, remonstrances, and appeals to the conscience and the loyalty of its members. Tait's energies were rather devoted to comprehension than to exclusion. Neither on the one side nor on the other would he employ coercive remedies till all else had failed. If called upon to choose between too great width and too great narrowness, he would, within the limits of Christian dogma, have chosen the former. The Church was designed to be a National Church, embracing diversities of opinion, as well as a Catholic Church, adhering to the Catholic truths of the Apostles. It was a witness at once to diversity and to essential unity in matters of faith. The policy of rulers of the Church had administered the law on the broad and tolerant principle of permitting freedom of opinion wherever such freedom was reasonable. And in practice this policy had been carried into effect. All three parties in the Church had received justice. Their distinctive doctrines had been treated with perfect equality. If the Gorham judgement favoured the

Low Churchman, or if the decision in 'Essays and Reviews' tolerated the Broad Churchman, the Bennett case extended the same liberty of thought to the Ritualists. In all three cases the effect of the decisions was to render it possible for those who held the three divergent views to remain in the Church of England, and preach their doctrines with its authority.

No bias against the Ritualists and no sudden departure from a consistent policy of toleration can explain the Public Worship Act. The origin of the measure must be sought elsewhere. For years past a tedious litigation upon ritual questions had occupied the attention of the Church courts; protests and counter-protests, memorials and replies, encouraged a petty spirit of partisanship; the existing law was admittedly uncertain and mischievous; men's time was wasted, and their minds unsettled, by futile contests; year after year drastic legislation was proposed by Lord Shaftesbury, which was designed to sweep away the anachronisms of the existing system, and, on the *tabula rasa* thus produced, to write a new Ecclesiastical Code. Under these conditions, the whole bench of bishops was practically unanimous in admitting the necessity for the new procedure which Convocation had demanded. To the two Archbishops was intrusted the preparation of the measure to facilitate, expedite, and cheapen proceedings in enforcing clergy discipline. Their scheme contemplated a revival of the *forum domesticum* of the bishops, with the addition of the coercive force required by modern circumstances. Owing to a variety of accidents, a garbled version of the plan had reached the public before its episcopal sponsors had an opportunity of explaining its meaning. Instantly the alarm was sounded. The flag of no surrender was hoisted by the High Churchmen, who detected in the proposal an intention to reduce ecclesiastical ritual to a dead level of monotonous uniformity. Scarcely less irritated were the Evangelicals, who were disappointed that a more drastic measure had not been proposed to further 'protestantise' the Church. The heated imagination of partisans effectually destroyed whatever chances the Bill might have had of becoming law as it was originally drafted. Under such circumstances, it might have been more prudent to abandon the measure. But on one point only was the Lower House of Convocation unanimously agreed—that some legislation was absolutely necessary. The Archbishop accordingly persevered, and the Bill was read a second

time. In Committee Lord Shaftesbury and Lord Cairns were able to force upon the Archbishops, no longer supported by the High Churchmen, the clauses, by which the office and authority of the two provincial judges were transferred to a single lay judge. The whole complexion of the Bill was altered. Either the amendment must be accepted, or the Bill abandoned in the face of the unanimous decision of Convocation, and with the certainty that it would be replaced by a new and drastic measure, still more intolerable to High Churchmen, which Lord Shaftesbury was prepared to introduce. Under extreme pressure, and in the midst of great difficulties, the Archbishop decided to accept the amendment, and the Bill, thus essentially altered, subsequently passed the Lower House, and became law substantially in the form in which it left the Lords. The Act proved to be ineffectual; it created a plausible grievance; it transferred public sympathy to the Ritualists; it did not touch the difficulty that the ultimate authority, on which rests the whole established law of the Church, was repudiated by the party. The Archbishop, in moving for the Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts, and in his touching letters from his deathbed, resorted to wiser counsels, when he endeavoured to strike a truce, during which disquiet might be allayed, and reasonable objections to existing procedure allowed.

The whole course of events connected with the passing of the Public Worship Act affords a conspicuous illustration of a deficiency in the Archbishop, which alienated the sympathies of a large section of the clergy. Fixing his eyes only on the practical end in view, Tait disregarded as petty details what other men raised to the dignity of fundamental principles. This fixedness of aim and disregard of difficulties enabled him often to overcome formidable obstacles; but they also gave him the appearance of a desire to ride roughshod over honest objections and tender scruples. It is in this sense, and in this sense only, that Tait was not the Archbishop of the clergy. Against this deficiency may be appropriately set his distinctive merit—that he familiarised the laity with a high ideal of the character that their Christian faith may generate. Even the Churchmen who most bitterly opposed his policy could not but acknowledge that nothing mean or petty entered into his conception, or his administration, of his office. No ecclesiastic of our time has ever evoked so universal an expression of regret and admiration as that

which followed Tait to the grave. Others have been more enthusiastically lauded by friends or followers; no one has commanded, in a similar degree, the confidence of the whole nation. The respect in which Tait was universally held is the more striking as his gifts were neither showy nor brilliant. Looking back at his life, its most conspicuous feature is the record of remarkable growth. His mind was ever learning; his character ripened, mellowed, and sweetened to the end. In his last written words: 'Both the Church and the world 'are entering on new phases,' combined with his request for the Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts, and with his dying letter to Mr. Mackonochie, men may recognise the freshness of a mind which was always open to new impressions, the large-hearted wisdom which accepts the possibility of error, and the statesmanlike prudence that, if a mistake proves to have been made, prepares for its correction. And the source of this perpetual expansion was the keen sense of duty and of personal responsibility which led him always to do his utmost, and never less than his best. It was thus that he rose to the requirements of the offices which he was successively called upon to occupy. His character was built up on simple, but solid, foundations. He was real, straightforward, manly, possessed of judgement, candour, decision, and the courage of his opinions. His mental balance was complete, and the strength and beauty of his character was seen in the harmony of his talents and feelings. Without this proportion his strong gift of humour might have imperilled his position; with it, his humour became a valuable ally, enabling him to relieve tension without loss of dignity, and to place himself easily and naturally on good terms with his audience. Nor was this perfect balance of that kind which produces amiable commonplace characters. It was corrected by great confidence and determination, by a natural, though repressed, impetuosity, and by a strong instinct for action. Few men so powerfully moulded as Tait could have administered their office with so conciliatory and statesmanlike a temper.

We began our remarks on the 'Life of Tait' by a comparison between himself and Newman as types of the Christian life. In the grave the contrasts end. The hymn sung when the Archbishop was laid to his rest was 'Lead, 'kindly Light,' the work of the Cardinal. It is a fitting symbol that no difference of opinion, however strongly held and strenuously contended for, can part men of real goodness.

ART. VIII.—1. *General Gordon's Events in the Taeping Rebellion.* London: 1891.

2. *Translations from the Pekin Gazette for* 1890; *North China Herald.* Shanghai: 1891.

3. *Correspondence respecting Anti-Foreign Riots in China.* (China: No. 3, 1891.)

4. *China, Religious and Moral.* By G. EUG. SIMON. London: 1887.

THE fallacy of human confidence in its own capacity for accurate prediction has received another illustration from recent events in China. Only a few months ago the Governments of the civilised world were congratulating themselves on the personal reception of their representatives at Pekin in audience by the Emperor of China, and were basing on that pleasant incident the hope, amounting almost to a positive conviction, that the old China, with its innate hostility to foreigners, and from which not only privileges, but even the admission of an equal natural right, could not be wrested except by sustained diplomatic effort with military coercion looming as a sort of reserve force in the background, had finally disappeared, and that in its place had arisen a solidly united China with a strong Government ready to carry out all its treaty obligations, and with a well-disposed people anxious to testify in every way its desire to live on terms of harmony with foreigners. The vision thus created was an agreeable one; but a few weeks served to dispel it, and to revive fears that have not been so acute for more than thirty years. Once more we are compelled to think that at Pekin there is a weak rather than a strong Government, and that without impeaching its good faith there is considerable doubt as to its ability to properly fulfil its treaty obligations, while throughout China is apparent an unequivocal and inveterate antipathy to foreigners which needs very little encouragement to break out into disturbances that render international harmony impossible. Even should the popular excitement yield on the present occasion to official treatment, enough has happened to modify our confidence in the indisputable power of the Pekin executive, and to seriously qualify the perhaps unreasonable expectation that China had accepted without reserve her place in the family of civilised nations, and that she might consequently be treated with the same candour and confidence as any of the recognised Great Powers.

So far as matters have yet progressed in China, there is rather need for vigilance than ground for alarm. The riots in several towns along the great river Yangtsekiang, accompanied as they have been with regrettable loss of English lives and much destruction of property, do not by themselves justify the conclusion that there is a resolve among the Chinese masses to expel the foreigners, and that we shall again be compelled to fight for the position we have acquired with such difficulty in their country. There have been more violent ebullitions of popular antipathy and greater loss of European lives since the Treaty of Pekin, as, for instance, the Tientsin massacre* in 1870, but they have proved of only ephemeral significance and have not seriously compromised China with foreign nations. If there is any reason to fear that the riots at Wuhu and Wusueh may be followed by graver consequences than the murder of French subjects in 1870, or of Mr. Margary in 1875, the explanation is to be found in the consideration of other circumstances that have come to our knowledge, and that relate to the internal condition of China and the stability of her own government. Without accepting the somewhat alarming conclusions that are based on those circumstances, they are of such a varied and interesting character as to claim detailed description and careful consideration. They involve not only the continuance of friendly relations betwen China and the Treaty Powers, but also the internal peace of China and the very existence of the ruling dynasty. It cannot be denied that there is an intimate connexion between the two sets of circumstances, for unless there was reason to be apprehensive as to the power of the Manchu Government, it is not to be supposed that a few riots in Central China would incline serious persons to jump to the conclusion that both the dynasty and the position of foreigners in China were imperilled. In any case we believe that the outbreak is not to be ascribed to religious intolerance, but to secular motives of hostility.

Two hundred and fifty years have now elapsed since the Manchus completed their conquest of China and established the present reigning dynasty at Pekin. If we consider the

* Twenty-one Europeans and thirty Chinese children were killed. The Europeans were the French Consul M. Fontanier, his secretary M. Simon, a member of the French Legation at Pekin and his wife, a French storekeeper and his wife, three priests, ten sisters of mercy, and a Russian merchant and his wife.

disparity of numbers between the conquerors and the conquered, the subjection of China by the Manchus was quite as remarkable as the English conquest of India. The Chinese were engaged for fifty years in defending their liberty and the native dynasty of the Mings against the hardier Tartar race of Manchuria which first took up arms against Chinese encroachment, and, encouraged by success, assumed the offensive upon the temptingly rich and, as it proved, ill-defended provinces of the Middle Kingdom. Although the Chinese fought with remarkable persistence and long after the chances of the Ming dynasty had been extinguished, the progress of the Manchus was steady and irresistible. Their success, no doubt, was largely due to the co-operation of the powerful and able Chinese viceroy Wou Sankwei; but when that satrap, dissatisfied with the position allotted him by the Manchus, attempted to set up an independent administration in the south-west provinces, he was vanquished by the generals of the Emperor Kanghi, and from that date to the Taeping rebellion no Chinese ventured to challenge the authority of the Tartar ruler at Pekin.

During the long period of its existence as the supreme ruling family in China, the Manchus have accomplished many notable feats, and have raised the position and power of that country to a higher point than it had reached under any purely Chinese ruler since a remote antiquity. Two of the most illustrious sovereigns who ever directed the destinies of a great people were the Emperors Kanghi and Keen Lung, and their reputation was, thanks to French writers, quite as great in Europe as in Asia. Their conquests carried Chinese authority across the continent of Asia to the Pamir on the one side, and the frontiers of India and Burmah on the other. The amplitude of their revenue and the majesty of their Court impressed those acquainted with the splendour of Versailles and the more sombre dignity of St. James's. If national gratitude can be chained by victories in peace and war, then the Chinese ought to be attached to that Tartar dynasty which has faithfully reflected the national type at the same time that it has invested the administration with increased vigour.

Nor was this claim weakened or forfeited by the long succession of national misfortunes which began with the first foreign war in 1839–42, and which did not end till Russia restored Kuldja, by the St. Petersburg Treaty, ten years ago. It is true these disasters, which included three adverse campaigns and many minor passages of an

unpleasant nature with European Powers, two successful Mahomedan rebellions in Central Asia and Yunnan, and one formidable Chinese revolt, which almost destroyed the dynasty, occurred under Manchu rulers; but, on the other hand, their suppression was effected by their energy and political sagacity. The Chinese unquestionably owe much to the dynasty which, despite popular prejudice, has concluded with foreign countries an arrangement that preserves the peace, and, at the same time, sustains the dignity of the Chinese. The Manchu is, indeed, the first Chinese dynasty, so far as history can instruct us, that overcame the dangers which seemed likely to overwhelm it, and, until the other day, the opinion was confidently held that it was now as firmly established in power as it was a century ago. The principal point for our future consideration is whether there is any valid reason for changing or qualifying this opinion.

The stability of the Manchu authority has been due more to the political sagacity with which its fortunes have been directed than to the military power upon which it is based. At the commencement the Manchus conquered China because they possessed a superior military organisation. The tribal confederacy among the Manchus and their allies the Mongols was admirably adapted to the purpose of maintaining the efficiency of the race for war, and as their main body consisted of mounted men, the Chinese, who have never possessed any cavalry worthy of the name, were unable to make any stand before them. The Tartar chivalry of the region beyond the Wall still represents the *élite* physically of the Chinese forces, and in the seventeenth century it was simply invincible as compared with any Chinese army. But as soon as the struggle in the field had been brought to a conclusion, the Manchus took steps to propitiate Chinese opinion and to establish their authority on a broad and popular basis. So far as the Manchus themselves had adopted in their administration at Moukden any of the principles of regular government, they were borrowed from the Chinese, and it was therefore only natural that they should accept the form of administration they found in China, more especially as it had been the object of admiration in Eastern Asia from remote antiquity. In all essential features the government of China remained under the Manchus precisely what it had been under the Mings. By one simple and unimpeachable fact, the shaving of the heads of the subject Chinese and the enforced adoption of the present pigtail, the Manchus established their conquest, and

then proceeded to assimilate themselves to, if not to efface themselves in, the race they had conquered.

In two matters only did the Manchus retain their own special organisation, and they were—the administration of the army, and that part of the court etiquette which related to the Imperial person. They kept the Manchu troops and the favoured Banners of the Mongols distinct from the ordinary Chinese troops, and they established in many of the principal cities an inner walled town known as the Tartar city. They also laid down that all reports and edicts submitted for the Emperor's approval with the Vermilion pencil should be presented to him in the Manchu language. With these two exceptions the administration of China went on on its old basis and in strict conformity with Confucian principle. The preservation of the old Manchu discipline and cohesion was justified by the desire to defend the Empire as well as to preserve the dynasty. For more than two centuries the Tartar army represented the only fighting force to which China could pretend. The Green Flag army was the most inefficient militia of an unwarlike race, and the only Chinese soldiers who made a respectable stand against European troops in the war of 1860 were the Tartars of Sankolinsin. No one would have thought that the Chinese were capable of being made good soldiers, but for what General Gordon did during the Taeping war with the levies which he turned into the Ever Victorious Army. The lesson he taught seems to have been learnt at least by Li Hung Chang, who has now organised in his own province what is supposed to be a very efficient and thoroughly well-equipped force in his Black Flag army, which is composed almost exclusively of Chinese. It is a point not without significance, and bearing directly on the present situation, to note that the Manchu military organisation is no longer so essential to the security of China, and that as a matter of fact the Chinese themselves form an important part of the modern army of their country.

While time has thus weakened the military pre-eminence of the Manchus, it has also diminished the value of the privilege which retained at the Court of Pekin the language of the smaller court and race capital at Moukden. The quiet process which has not merely effaced the distinctive marks of the Manchu conquest, but has made the Tartar régime assume a more and more unqualified Chinese complexion, is proved by a comparatively speaking trifling incident. During the greater part of the last thirty years China has been governed

by one or two empress regents, and as they were placed in power not by popular support, but by palace intrigue, it would naturally be assumed that they would be Manchu ladies. But such a supposition would be entirely erroneous. Both the empress regents were Chinese, and so ignorant of the Manchu tongue that a special edict had to be issued authorising all reports, which had always been submitted in that language, to be presented in Chinese. At the same moment that the military instinct and habits of the Manchus have become less essential to the maintenance of the Chinese Empire, the long absence from the throne of an emperor has insensibly diminished the hold he possesses on the popular mind, and has caused the removal of more than one of the few distinctive tokens that marked the Manchu dynasty as separate from the Chinese nation. For reasons that will be made clear hereafter, the removal of those tokens, far from being, as might be thought, an indication of increased union, is ominous of coming trouble and dissension.

Great as have been the reputation and power of the Manchus in the past, there is much in their present position to prevent our scouting the idea that a rebellion got up for the express purpose of deposing them would necessarily meet with failure. It may be said that the Manchus are safe, from the very fact that they are not to be distinguished from other Chinese, and that the imperial court is more and more approximating to the ideal type of the Chinese patriarchs; but there is one patent and undeniable fact which stamps the reigning dynasty as a foreign one in the eyes of every true Confucian, and that is the position of the capital. For the seat of government to be fixed at Pekin signifies to every true son of Han that the supreme authority rests in foreign hands, because Pekin has only been the capital under Tartar rulers such as the Kin (the Golden Horde dynasty), the Mongol, and the Manchu. With the Chinese the seat of government has always been on the Yangtsekiang, or in the west, and, speaking in precise terms, Nankin is both the natural and the popular metropolis of the Middle Kingdom. General Gordon, whose narrative of the Taeping rebellion has just been published, perceived this fact, and in more than one memorandum endeavoured to impress on the Pekin authorities the advisability of transferring the capital from the north to the centre of the country; but however excellent the advice might be from the Chinese point of view, it was very unpalatable from the Tartar, and the fact must be accepted that so long as there is a Manchu dynasty

the seat of power will be at Pekin on account of its proximity to the birth and burial places of the imperial race.

The consideration of the position occupied by the Manchu dynasty reveals some of the perils by which any foreign domination must be beset in the country it has conquered. Although some of them have acquired increased significance during the last thirty years, they do not in themselves justify the conclusion that the reigning dynasty is in any immediate danger, or that it would be unable to hold its ground against a Chinese outbreak. It must be remembered that the statement that the Chinese are anxious to cast off the Manchu yoke, and to possess a ruler of their own, is one that has been made for a great many years with or without plausible reason. A local disturbance, the activity of any of the secret societies, or the boasting of a band of robbers has been sufficient on which to base the report that China was on the verge of disintegration, and that the days of the Manchu dynasty were numbered. But the danger has not merely always vanished, it has never assumed any tangible shape. If the dynasty is exposed at the present time to any more serious danger, it must arise from some more insidious and less defined cause, and this can only be the poverty of the Manchu family in men of talent resulting in the practical effacement of the dynasty, or the personal ambition of one of the great viceroys, who may wish to advance his own ends at the expense of the reigning family, which he believes to be in a state of decrepitude and incapable of defending itself.

The recent death of Prince Chun has served to bring out very clearly the want of capable men in the imperial family of China. As father of the Emperor Kwangsu, it might be thought that he owed his fame to the accidental selection of his son as successor to Tungche when that young ruler died suddenly in 1875; but as a matter of fact the elevation of his son to the Dragon Throne proved a serious, and might have been a fatal, obstacle to his taking any active part in the administration, for it is one of the first principles of Chinese ethics that a father must not serve under his son. It argued an exceptional amount of courage and self-assertion for Prince Chun to ignore this established usage, and to appear before the Chinese in some of the highest military and political offices of the Crown. There was no doubt also of Prince Chun's ability. The share in the credit of the regency of the empresses to which he was properly entitled may never be known, but he certainly organised the garrison of the capital, known as the Pekin Field Force, and made it

scarcely if at all less efficient than Li Hung Chang's army, and the Board of National Defence was his own creation. The presence of an energetic and capable prince in the palace with special influence, and indeed authority, over the emperor, was a great protection for the dynasty, and calculated to deter any ambitious viceroy from breaking his allegiance. His death last January at a comparatively early age was a serious and perhaps irreparable blow for the dynasty, for among the supporters of the throne none is left, so far as it is possible to discover, with anything like his position or ability to play the part of Manchu champion. His brother, Prince Kung, well known to Europeans from his having signed the Treaty of Pekin, and from his long conduct of foreign affairs, has been in disgrace since 1884, and does not possess either the military training or personal courage to rally or direct the Manchu forces in any emergency. There is no other son of the Emperor Taoukwang left to uphold the fortunes of their house, and among the Manchu and Mongol chiefs around the throne such notabilities as Pao Wang—son of the famous Sankolinsin—and Ko Wang, 'the iron-capped 'princes,' to whose defence is entrusted the person of the emperor, are little more than shadows of departed greatness.

To complete the picture of the Manchu régime as it exists at present, there remains only the person of the reigning emperor, Kwangsu, and there is little or no doubt that his character will exercise a determining influence on the future of both China and his own dynasty. The Emperor Kwangsu is a young man according to our ideas, having only completed his twentieth year in August, but he has now exercised for three years the personal functions of government. During the greater part of that period he was assisted by Prince Chun, and it was impossible to distinguish his own influence from that of his father; but the rumours which reach the outer world from even 'the Forbidden City,' and the personal sight which the foreign ministers obtained of his Majesty at the audience last March, have helped to throw some light on his person and character. Everything that has been learnt of the Emperor Kwangsu is favourable to his intelligence and amiability. He seems not merely to have been carefully brought up to discharge the dignified and difficult ceremonies of his high station, but also by inclination as well as training to be disposed to pursue an enlightened policy towards foreign countries. The impression made by the Emperor Kwangsu on the foreigners

who saw him at the audience was most favourable, and the following description of him by one who was present will be read with interest in connexion with current events:—

'The magnificence of the courtiers' attire contrasted strangely with the simplicity of the appearance of the young emperor who rules a fourth of the human race, and whose features have never before been seen save by the highest of his own subjects. Whatever the impression "the Barbarians" made on him, the idea which they carried away of the Emperor Kwangsu was pleasing and almost pathetic. His air is one of exceeding intelligence and gentleness, somewhat frightened and melancholy looking. His face is pale, and, though it is distinguished by refinement and quiet dignity, it has none of the force of his martial ancestors, nothing commanding or imperial, but is altogether mild, delicate, sad, and kind. He is essentially Manchu in features, his skin is strangely pallid in hue, which is, no doubt, accounted for by the confinement of his life inside those forbidding walls, and the absence of the ordinary pleasures and pursuits of youth, with the constant discharge of onerous, complicated, and difficult duties of state, which, it must be remembered, are, according to Imperial Chinese etiquette, mostly transacted between the hours of two and six in the morning. His face is oval-shaped, with a very long, narrow chin, and a sensitive mouth with thin, nervous lips; his nose is well shaped and straight, his eyebrows regular and very arched, while the eyes are unusually large and mournful in expression. The forehead is well shaped and broad, and the head is large beyond the average. He looked anxious, watchful, somewhat nervous, and more overcome than anyone present by the unusual experience. His dress was a plain puce-coloured silken robe with a golden dragon embroidered on the breast and shoulders. He sat cross-legged, like a Buddha, in front of the table, and played nervously with his hands while the ordeal lasted. He wore nothing in the shape of a crown or other emblem of his high office, his head-covering being an ordinary Chinese official hat of felt surmounted by a button of knotted crimson silk.'

This description is calculated to enhance our opinion more of the emperor's high mental qualities than of his physical strength and martial character. However wise and capable he may show himself as a ruler, it is quite clear that he has not inherited his father's love of military matters, and that, although he may exhibit equal judgement to any of his predecessors in selecting his commanders, he will never himself be a great warrior, as would be natural in a Manchu chief. The anxiety caused by his apparent want of physical strength and delicate health is far better based than any arising from an unreasonable expectation that a Manchu Emperor of China should be a born soldier. If anything were to happen to the Emperor Kwangsu, it would be difficult to know where or how his successor would be found, and the selection of

either his uncle Prince Kung, or another child representative of the Manchu dynasty, would be attended with many obvious disadvantages, and possibly grave peril. Admitting, therefore, that all that is known of the Emperor Kwangsu, whose desire for a knowledge of the outer world is revealed from time to time by his edicts in the 'Pekin Gazette,' and who deserves recognition at the hands of all foreign writers and governments for having carried out the treaty stipulations on the subject of personal audience, and for having made it an annual ceremony, is extremely favourable to his intelligence and to his friendly disposition towards the Treaty Powers, it cannot be disputed that he personally does not add to the stability of the Manchu dynasty.

There is, however, another point of view from which the position of Kwangsu must be considered, and that is not as representative of the Manchu family, but as occupant of the Dragon Throne, or, in other words, as Emperor of China. The particular family to which he happens to belong may be threatened or not with danger; but the institution of which he is the representative is as firmly established as ever in the veneration of the Chinese nation. No doubt need be entertained as to their regarding their sovereign as ruler by the decree of Heaven, and as occupying towards them the paternal position which forms the basis of Chinese domestic and political life. M. Simon aptly reminds us that it is an accepted maxim in China that 'the family is a small state, 'and the state only a federation of families,' and the most popular designation of the emperor is that of 'father and 'mother of his people.' However much the authority of the emperor may have been injured by its having remained so long in abeyance, and by its having been exercised by female representatives under the regency—for the Chinese have little or no respect for women in posts of power—it is not the imperial office that suffers in public esteem, but only the individual who fills it and the particular family that he represents. If the Chinese were to revolt to-morrow, their declared purpose would be not to overthrow the empire and dispense with a supreme ruler, but to substitute some other family for the Manchu, and to revive, if possible, the Ming dynasty, which was overthrown by the Tartars. The Taeping chieftain, Tien Wang, or Heavenly King, put forward his pretensions to the Chinese throne on the ground that they were derived from celestial inspiration, and the proceedings of his court at Nankin were regulated by as close an observance as his resources would admit of the

etiquette of the earlier Chinese sovereigns. It will always be the same so long as China bears any resemblance to that which we know, and which history tells us, has existed from its beginning. The adventurer or the patriot will never venture to have any other programme than is covered by the avowed intention of restoring to the imperial office the character and virtue which ought to surround it in accordance with the precepts and delineation of the ancient sages. To put forward republican or socialistic theories would be to shock Chinese opinion, and to ensure for the enterprise speedy and ignominious failure.

As the Emperor Kwangsu now rules in his own name, and has shown a marked tendency to follow his own opinions rather than that of the still living Western empress, only the continuance of his life is necessary to satisfy his subjects that the imperial title has not become null and void, and that after an interval of almost thirty years they have to deal with a personal sovereign. There is no reason why a Manchu ruler should not satisfy all the secret feelings of the Chinese in their wish to be convinced that the occupant of the Dragon throne is their direct mediator with Heaven. The empress regents did not satisfy those feelings, and we cannot but think that if the reign of Kwangsu were to prove as brief as that of his cousin Tungche, and if his death were to be followed by the return of the Western empress to power, there would be a large increase of dissatisfaction in the country, and that millions of true Confucianists would deem that the Manchu dynasty was no longer worthy of governing the Middle Kingdom. These apprehensions cannot be put aside as chimerical when we learn on excellent authority that the relations between the emperor and the Western empress are far from cordial, and that the ex-empress regent feels and regrets the loss of the power which she exercised so long and with such great ability. So long as Prince Chun, her close ally of many years, lived, she retained some share in the administration and the personal satisfaction of feeling that she had not lost all her influence. But since his father's death Kwangsu has shown himself less amenable to her direction, and more disposed to act on his own judgement, supported, if by anyone, by the Grand Council alone. There are many well-placed persons who aver that the ex-empress regent will not submit to be effaced, and that the first slip on the part of the young and inexperienced ruler will enable her to reassert her power in the same way as she did after the premature death of

Tungche. The success of this empress would be personal alone, it would tend to weaken the position of the dynasty, and it would add immensely to the dissatisfied feelings that have been alluded to. An incident recorded in one of the announcements of the 'Pekin Gazette' of 1890 serves to bring out very clearly the inconvenience of the autocrat of China not exercising his own proper functions. It is therein recorded that the present Empress of China, that is the wife of the Emperor Kwangsu, offered sacrifice at the Temple of the Goddess of Sericulture for the first time during the last thirty years, and that, owing to the long desuetude into which an annual practice had fallen, the officials had great difficulty in ascertaining what was the correct ceremony. This is only one instance of the functions that must remain in abeyance when the emperor does not himself exercise the imperial authority.

The Manchu dynasty has, however, a stronger basis than is furnished by the military resources of the governing race, or by the support of those officials who claim kinship in blood with the emperor. It has been accepted for more than two hundred and fifty years as a Chinese government by the mass of the nation, and it unquestionably still enjoys the support of the great majority of Chinese officials. Something has been said about the dearth of Manchu statesmen at the present moment, but there is no scarcity of remarkable officials of Chinese race who are quite capable of rendering the emperor efficient and loyal service. Its enemies may denounce the Manchu dynasty as foreign, but in all essential points it is thoroughly Chinese, and the administration of the country is conducted by a civil service in which by far the preponderating element is Chinese.* Responsible Chinese officials cannot but see that a change of dynasty would not benefit their position or promote any national interest. The Manchus may be of an alien and, as is considered, inferior race, but their rule is based on Chinese principles, and is upheld by an official class which is almost exclusively Chinese. Any project to depose the dynasty will inevitably be formed from only one of two considerations. Some ambitious and well-informed viceroy may consider that the Manchu family is so effete, and that its power and

* This is fairly shown by the result of the annual examination of provincial graduates at Pekin in 1890. Out of 328 successful candidates only 9 were Manchus, 4 Mongols, and 7 Chinese Bannermen. The remaining 308 were pure Chinese or 'sons of Han.'

position are so moribund, that only the slightest push is required to hurl it from its pride of place; or in the collisions of rival viceroys, which threaten to form a new phase of Chinese life, one or other of the candidates for power may feel impelled to strengthen his own cause by an open attack on the dynasty, and by an avowed intention to supersede it. We believe that the more carefully the matter is considered, the more evident it will appear that any danger to the Manchu dynasty can only present itself in a practical form under one of these two heads.

Of the Chinese officials to whom reference has been made, the most distinguished and the ablest by general consent is Li Hung Chang, not merely Viceroy of the metropolitan province of Petchili, but Grand Secretary, and thus a member of that inner Imperial Council which is far above the Tsungli Yamen, and which represents, if any single body does, the responsible government of China. His career in its main features is known throughout the civilised world, and he is the only Chinese statesman, living or dead, whose name would be recognised in any assemblage of people. He has earned this widespread fame by the practical services he has rendered his own country, and by the exceptional purposes to which he has turned his influence and position as the head viceroy of the empire, as well as by the conspicuous ability and tact with which he has conducted the relations of his country generally, and on more than one critical occasion, when only his presence averted war with the Treaty Powers. Nobody can question the statement that China owes her modern army and navy, so far as she possesses them, to Li Hung Chang. Without him military reforms would never have taken any practical form, and the ironclads, shipyards, and arsenals which now make such an imposing array would never have been created. He also has consistently supported and strengthened the Customs Department, which forms the backbone of China's credit, and his arrangement for the collection of lekin at the ports was expressly intended for the purpose of strengthening the Central Government, and placing in its hands the effectual control of all the financial resources of the empire. But he rendered still more valuable service to his country when he negotiated satisfactory settlements of the Tientsin massacre with France, of the Yunnan trouble arising from the murder of Mr. Margary with England, and when he gave peaceful counsels in connexion with the difficulty with Russia about Kuldja, and with France about Tonquin.

The very splendour of his services inevitably raised up enemies to his person near the throne, and for a long time under the regency he was more the object of the suspicion than of the respect of the imperial family, although in every difficulty they never hesitated to appeal to his patriotism, ability, and reputation with foreigners for good faith, to extricate them from the position in which their obstinacy or dilatoriness had placed them. For the longer portion of his career also his authority was essentially provincial rather than metropolitan, and he had no direct voice in the government of the empire. As Viceroy of Petchili, with his residence at Tientsin, he was a great magnate, but his influence on the imperial policy was practically little or *nil*. It was only after his appointment to the office of Grand Secretary that he acquired the right to express his views in the imperial council chamber and the position to see them enforced in the policy of his government. The growing inclination of the emperor since Prince Chun's death to consult the Grand Secretaries, and to be guided by their advice rather than by that of the Western empress, is a satisfactory fact in itself, and conducive to harmony in China's foreign relations, so long at least as Li Hung Chang is one of the number. Sufficient proof of this has already been furnished by the imperial edict issued on the subject of the disturbances on the Yangtsekiang, and by the unquestionably sincere desire of the Pekin Government to nip those disorders in the bud and to avert all foreign complications.

The ablest of the Chinese officials and the first in rank faithfully reflects in his loyalty to the emperor and the reigning dynasty the feeling which is prevalent throughout the great body of the civil service. There have been many attempts to represent Li Hung Chang as being dissatisfied with his position and disloyal at heart. Some foreigners have even been suspected of inciting this satrap of the empire to aspire to the throne himself, with the view to his establishing a more accommodating government. General Gordon denounced all such attempts in the strongest terms, both because he divined they would be futile in the result, and also because he considered that, however useful Li Hung Chang might be as an intelligent viceroy at Tientsin, he would be helpless for good if by some extraordinary effort he made himself sovereign at Pekin. There are the strongest reasons for believing that such ambitious thoughts as these have never been seriously entertained by Li Hung Chang.

He knows better than his foreign admirers how difficult, if not impossible, it would be for him to establish an administration of his own, and that, if he succeeded in ousting the Manchu, he could not hope to have his authority recognised throughout the nineteen provinces, or to pass it on to his son. If he had at any time meditated treason, he would have put his plans into execution when the mysterious death of Tungche, followed by the disappearance of his widow, Ahluta, and the somewhat arbitrary and questionable selection of the present emperor, afforded them every opportunity of proving successful. That he did not act at a moment when the Manchu family itself was divided on the question of a revival of a female regency, when there were recent public events of a mysterious and sensational character to influence the public mind of China, and when his reputation was as great as it is to-day, which was clearly proved by his being appointed a few months later plenipotentiary for the settlement of the grave difficulties adjusted under the Chefoo Convention, is the strongest evidence that no such thought of self-aggrandisement entered his head. If he was loyal in 1875 under every inducement to be disloyal, for he was certainly disliked by the Court, and still smarting from the undeserved disgrace inflicted upon him for his alleged neglect to support a general against the Nienfei rebels, there has never been any reason to suspect him since, and those who indulge in building up ancient and exploded theories as to Li Hung Chang's designs upon the throne will certainly be disappointed, for, if a crisis has arrived in the history of the Manchus, the one certain fact amid much that is uncertain is, that he will prove a loyal supporter of that Pekin administration which he has served with not less disinterestedness than fidelity under four emperors and during two long regencies. If there be any valid ground for supposing that the Manchu dynasty is in peril, and if it contains many elements of weakness within itself, the assurance of the fidelity of Li Hung Chang controlling one of the two trained armies of China, the northern navy, and the Customs Department, together with the confidence of the foreign Governments and communities, is sufficient in itself to justify the belief that no attempt to upset the authority of the Emperor Kwangsu would be likely to succeed or even to be made.

Some reasons have been given in support of the confident belief that Li Hung Chang is a loyal servant of the emperor, but there are others which derive their force from the pre-

sent situation as it is described by observers on the spot, who think they see in the fermentation of the people of Central China a settled purpose and a project of national enfranchisement. This view is held not by irresponsible persons alone, but by the official representatives of this country in China. In the last blue book * issued on Chinese affairs, the reader will find among the evidence carefully collected by Consul Gardner, of Hankow, a positive statement, based on the admissions of a Chinese official, that 'the object of the riots caused by the secret societies was 'not so much hostility to Europeans as hostility to their own 'government.' Accepting for a moment as an indisputable fact the existence of this hostility to the Manchu Government, it will be obvious how anxious its fomenters would be to obtain the support of an official like Li Hung Chang, of pure Chinese descent and the highest reputation. They might be excused for thinking that his co-operation would suffice to ensure the success of their cause, but, when they realised that his support was not to be obtained, they turned in other directions to secure the aid they so much needed from a capable man of affairs. There is no evidence as yet that they have succeeded in this quest, but it is quite clear how they have set about it. The first article in their programme has been hostility to foreigners, because that seemed the best way to embarrass the Government; the second is the vague and impracticable declaration as to supplanting the Manchu in favour of another dynasty; and the third, in which their astuteness is more clearly shown than in the others, is to excite the inter-provincial jealousy, which if communications were more perfect would probably rend the united Empire of China into several hostile fragments.

The particular form in which they have sought to arouse that jealousy involves a direct attack upon Li Hung Chang. They declare that he has shown undue preference to officials of his own native province of Anhui and the neighbouring one of Kiangsi, forming together the Viceroyalty of the Liang Kiang, and they have endeavoured to incite the warlike and enterprising people of Hunan and Hupeh—forming the Viceroyalty of Houkwang—to resent this undeserved favour, and to show that they will not acquiesce in any other part of the empire receiving precedence of their own. This attempt may not have been altogether unsuccessful, for undoubtedly the hopes of the men of Hunan,

* China, No. 3, 1891, p. 21.

which were raised to a high point by the exceptional influence of the Hunan family of Tseng, have been much diminished by the recent deaths of the Marquis Tseng and his uncle, Tseng Kwo Tsiuen, and as Hunan officials and Hunan braves are known to be the most energetic and courageous in the Chinese services it will not do to despise the discontent that has been slowly growing, if it has rather suddenly revealed itself in the most important part of Central China. To clinch the argument on the subject of Li Hung Chang's predilections and attitude, it need only be pointed out that the desired exaltation of Hunan, based on an alleged partiality of Li for his own province, is not calculated to enlist his sympathy or support, and is calculated to keep his allegiance to the emperor from swerving.

But if the promoters of sedition have failed with Li Hung Chang, that is no reason why they should not succeed with some other Chinese viceroy whose ambition may be greater than his knowledge, and who may not also be free on personal grounds of envy from that dislike of Li Hung Chang which the patriots or rioters of Hunan entertain from his imputed desire to unduly advance men born in the neighbouring province of Anhui. It is known beyond doubt that, while they are actively endeavouring to obtain allies in the public service, many officials are coquetting with them and endeavouring to obtain some idea of their resources, and as to how far their own prospects would be improved before throwing in their lot with them. The result of this partial gravitation of two discontented bodies towards each other has yet to be ascertained, and there is no immediate reason to believe that they have won over the sympathies of the Viceroy Chang Che Tung, who ranks after Li Hung Chang, *sed longo intervallo*, among the magnates of the empire, and who is, moreover, personally jealous of Li's ascendency. But there are many who think that the apathy shown by Chang in dealing with the rioters in the two provinces for which he is responsible indicates dissatisfaction with his own position, and a wavering allegiance towards his sovereign. His conduct is in striking contrast with the somewhat boastful proclamation he issued on taking up his post in the summer of 1890, wherein he declared his intention 'of keeping the country free from brigandage and the army efficient.' But in all probability he will stop short of open rebellion unless the disturbers of the public peace should meet with some unexpected success, or unless he be driven to desperation by

the emperor dismissing him from his post for his neglect and incompetence.

Chang Che Tung, the new aspirant to popularity among the Chinese masses, was born in the year 1836. He is a native of the province of Petchili, and took such high honours at the local examinations that he had no difficulty in being enrolled a doctor of the celebrated Hanlin College. As a reader of that institution he was brought into close contact with the emperor, among whose tutors he might be considered, and as the reward of his services in this character he was appointed secretary to the Grand Council. As Governor of Shansi, as Viceroy of the Two Kwang, and now of Houkwang, he has managed to keep himself in the front rank of Chinese officials, but he first obtained what might be called public notoriety in 1889, when he put himself forward in a very marked manner as the opponent of the highest functionaries in the empire, and succeeded in thwarting their plans if not in carrying his own. This conflict of authority arose in connexion with the projected railway from Tientsin to Pekin, which was of the greatest practical utility in itself, and which seemed likely to accustom the public to the introduction of railways under the most favourable circumstances. This line of railway was specially promoted by the chief members of the imperial family and by Li Hung Chang. Both Prince Chun and the empress regent gave it their express approval, and the young emperor, whose favourite amusement had been working a miniature railway set up in the grounds of his palace, was cordially in favour of the scheme. It is scarcely necessary to add that Li was a staunch supporter of a scheme which was in all essential points his own creation. With the most powerful personages thus agreed on the subject, the ordinary reader will find it hard of credence that one official of comparatively little importance and position could mar their arrangements, and compel them to suspend their project. Yet this is precisely what Chang Che Tung accomplished. At the time Chang Che Tung was viceroy of Kwangtung and Kwangsi, with his residence at Canton, from which city he constituted himself the severest critic of the imperial administration, addressing memorials to the throne on every conceivable subject, citing the ancient classics, and professing to have more knowledge of public affairs and Western improvements than the whole conclave of the emperor's advisers at Pekin.

When, therefore, the railway from Tientsin to the capital was not merely formally sanctioned, but absolutely com-

menced, he at once hastened to denounce it as a useless scheme, which would weaken the imperial position and benefit foreigners alone. His violent denunciation of the scheme received the approval and stimulated the opposition of the villagers who resented the passage of the railway in the vicinity of their family tombs, and by thus exciting popular prejudice he compelled the Government to desist from its intention. At the same time, in order to show his own intelligence and that he was not biassed by any antiquated prejudice to railways, he propounded a gigantic scheme of his own for a railway through the interior of China from Hankow to Pekin. The construction of such a railway would require an enormous expenditure of money and an exceedingly long period of time, and, practically speaking, such a scheme was as visionary as a railway from Khartoum to Cape Town would be at this moment. Chang Che Tung in mooting such a quixotic undertaking could only have intended to throw ridicule on railways in China, and to postpone their commencement to the Greek kalends. But in one respect he overreached himself. His opposition thwarted the Imperial Government, and gave him the satisfaction of a cheap triumph, but those who acted for the emperor took him at his word, and transferred him from Canton to Hankow for the special purpose of constructing the railway which he had advocated with so much eloquence. It is not clear yet how far the emperor and his advisers will proceed against this troublesome official, but their method of dealing with him has put in their hands the means of showing that Chang, far from being an intelligent critic, is only a vain boaster. The Pekin Government has such a complete case against Chang Che Tung that at any moment it can remove him from his post, and order him to proceed to the capital for punishment, with the complete approval of the whole service to which he belongs, and that this step will be taken at what is deemed the right moment scarcely admits of doubt.

Passing from the consideration of individuals to a scrutiny of the waves of feeling that agitate the ignorant masses of China, and of which we only see the bent when it has assumed a violent form dangerous to the persons and business of foreigners, we are compelled to entertain the opinion that a large section of the Chinese people are very much dissatisfied with their present condition, and that they are moved by an active hostility to Europeans as well as to their own Government, which has not been visible for a great

many years. The causes of this popular discontent are not to be found in any such archaic reasons as dislike of the Manchu as a foreign dynasty, or an affection for the old Ming family, which, curiously enough, is represented at the Pekin Court by a Marquis Ch'eng, who annually visits the tombs of his family at Nankin, and then returns to the northern capital to render homage to the emperor. They relate mainly to their own mundane affairs and misfortunes, and, although there may be other circumstances of a similar kind of which we are unaware, they may be divided under three heads—the badness of trade and agriculture in Central China, the inadequate pay of the officials, and the natural calamities for which the Government is made the scapegoat. If the Pekin Government is to be relieved of its own anxieties, it will promptly recognise these facts, and take steps to mitigate the general suffering, and to restore contentment and efficiency to the ranks of its own employés. As will be evident to any member of the Tsungli Yamen, it is far more advantageous to devote the large sums paid from time to time as indemnities to injured foreigners to such purposes as the salaries of the principal officials, the provision of a larger police force, and the benefit of suffering agriculturists.

Fifteen years have now elapsed since the cultivation of tea in India, and afterwards in Ceylon also, began to affect the Chinese market. Although the Chinese received early warning that the consequences of this rivalry would be serious, they derided the danger, and in this they were much encouraged by the opinions of the foreign merchants themselves. The first consequence was a check to the export of Chinese tea, which had been increasing annually, and on which at oné time the whole world seemed dependent, and then it became clear that the same quantity would no longer be sold as in former years. This diminution was rendered the more serious by the Chinese having placed a larger area under cultivation, by the feverish competition of rival hongs, and by the fall of prices to a point where profit was almost impossible. It was said, and the evidence on the subject if not conclusive was at least considerable, that the quality of Chinese tea had deteriorated in a marked manner, and that through hasty preparation it was next to impossible to obtain what was called a fine 'chop.' A few years ago Li Hung Chang, foreseeing the injury that would be done by the depreciation in general estimation of China tea, issued a memorial enjoining on all concerned the absolute

necessity of keeping up its reputation by paying every attention to its preparation; but it is to be feared that little heed was given to this advice, for the export of tea from China has steadily fallen. It is almost impossible for us to imagine how great has been the loss thus inflicted on the immense population, not short of one hundred millions, of those provinces which form the principal tea region of China, and we cannot feel surprised if these ignorant agriculturists associate foreigners, who now decline to purchase their tea as of old, with those misfortunes which have fallen upon them through the exigencies of the law of supply and demand. The Pekin Government has to face the unpleasant fact, that a very considerable portion of its people inhabiting the hitherto most favoured parts of the country are suffering from an extensive agricultural depression which has seriously reduced their means of support, and which has led them to think that their misfortunes are caused by others, and that their only remedy lies in expelling foreigners and in changing their own Government.

If this opinion were held by the peasants of China without any organisation of their own for giving it effect, the Imperial Government should still pay heed to its mutterings, and endeavour to remove the cause of dissatisfaction. But it assumes a distinctly more formidable character, from the fact that the Chinese do possess such an organisation in the secret societies which have been common in China for many centuries, and whose activity revives after more or less protracted intervals of stagnation. We seem to have reached such an epoch now, for, after a period of quiescence that dates back to the eve of the Taeping rebellion, they are beginning to manifest an activity that has made them a danger to the State, and that threatens to involve the administration in foreign as well as domestic trouble. The student of Chinese history will recollect that for the first fifty years of this century the Water Lily and Triad societies were the cause of serious disturbances in the different ports to which we had access. Although they never possessed sufficient numbers or resources to menace the existence of the Pekin Government, they certainly embarrassed its action, and when the Taepings appeared on the Yangtse, with their avowed intention of overthrowing the Tartars and establishing a national dynasty and capital at Nankin, many of them openly joined the ranks of the rebels, whilst others broke out on their own account in several of the towns of Southern China. But beyond augmenting the forces of the Taepings they

never threatened the Government with any serious danger, except when some members of the Water Lily society broke into the Forbidden City, and almost succeeded in murdering the Emperor Kiaking in his palace. During the complications with England and France the Triads certainly obtained possession of the native city of Shanghai, and the foreign settlement at that place had to be defended against them; but this was their only success on what might be called a considerable scale. Neither the Water Lily nor the Triad society, both of which were among the most popular and strongest in numbers of any associations that have existed in China, ever seriously menaced the Manchu régime. Had they murdered Kiaking, who was one of the most incompetent rulers China ever possessed, they would, far from injuring it, have probably strengthened it, and averted some of the after consequences of his folly. If there were any object to be served, or if the subject were more interesting, we could trace back the history of secret societies in China under former dynasties to the Crimson Eyebrows of four thousand years ago, and show that no dynasty has ever been overthrown by the machinations of a secret society. There is less reason than ever to suppose that the Government of the country can be subverted by a concealed association of dissatisfied persons, who are mainly moved by a desire to obtain an easy and profitable livelihood by trading on the credulity or good nature of others.

But the existence of discontent on a large scale being established, it necessarily follows that the secret societies who have at least acquired the habit of organisation, and some of the training of regular discipline, not merely acquire special importance as focussing public opinion, but facilitate any combination of hostile elements to the Government. Perhaps this consideration is strengthened by the character of the particular society which is most active at the present moment, and which is credited with the authorship of the riots along the Yangtse. This society, known as the Kolao Hui, originated among the Hunan braves raised by Tseng Kwofan, father of the Marquis Tseng, more than forty years ago to oppose the Taepings. Its primary object was merely to ensure the regular payment of their hire by the civil mandarins who lived upon peculation, and it still retains an influence among the native Chinese soldiery which no other society has ever possessed. This is not very surprising when it is proved on excellent authority that the society possessed the power to carry out its own decree of

death upon any imperial official who was denounced as being notoriously in the habit of pocketing the pay intended for the Chinese local army. The Kolao society has felt bound to extend its programme. The subscriptions of the ill-paid brave would not have enabled its promoters to flourish as they have done. During the last thirty years it has admitted freely anyone who would sign its articles and contribute to its coffers, and the coolie class has freely responded to the solicitations of its agents, who often put down names in their list without the permission of their owners. But in order to obtain these recruits the society has had to extend its programme, and to take up subjects with which it originally did not concern itself. Its directors, who are certainly members of the official class, long hesitated as to the new bent they should give their association, and it was not until they found that the depression of trade was reviving an anti-foreign feeling that they decided to make one of their objects the expulsion of Europeans, and especially of European missionaries. Since they adopted this line their numbers have largely increased, and they are practically omnipotent among the ignorant villagers from Szchuen to the Great River. Although a Hunan society in its origin, the great province of Szchuen is undoubtedly the real base of its power. Nowhere else is the Chinese 'brave' as distinct from the regular soldier, whether Tartar or Chinese, so much the master of the situation, and in no other province is the antipathy of the literates and the mob to Christianity more extreme. Geographically, as well as politically, the vast province of Szchuen is detached from the rest of the empire, and if Chang Che Tung were resident at Chingtu instead of Hankow he might set up an ephemeral power of his own.

It is significant to note that the main object with the Kolao society now is to expel foreigners from their country, and with this object they are willing to endorse every old woman's story as to the sinister designs of the missionaries on Chinese children, and even to incite reckless vagabonds to commit crimes that will support their allegations. For the complete success of their plans they have had to attack their own Government, as well as foreign individuals, for the treaties signed by it are the authority for the presence of the 'foreign devils.' This declared hostility must largely affect our own opinion of the Kolao society. When it made the expulsion of foreigners the first article in its programme, it ceased to be an object that we could treat

with indifference. Secret societies for promoting the social welfare of the Chinese, or even for changing the dynasty, are bodies with which we need never concern ourselves; but we cannot extend our toleration to the growth of an association which is specially designed to injure us, and which is already responsible for the deaths of several Europeans and the destruction of much property. It is impossible for us not to regret that the Chinese people still show such unreasoning animosity towards foreigners, and that they are so easily misled by designing persons as to the intentions of the missionaries who, apart from all religious questions, have rendered the poor people, in whatever district they may have happened to be, invaluable services as doctors. The acts of the Kolao society, and the general demeanour of the populace along the Yangtsekiang, have effectually dispelled the belief that used to be prevalent that the Chinese people were really more friendly and more inclined to intercourse with foreign nations than the Government at Pekin. We can now see with perfect distinctness that our only hope of making the Chinese reconciled to occupying a place in the family of nations lies in the sagacity of the central administration and the pressure we and the other Powers can bring to bear on it. It is the Chinese Government that extended its protection to those practising the Christian religion; it is the Chinese masses which represent missionaries as stealers and murderers of children. It is the Chinese Government that has approved of the introduction of railways, and that actually commenced to build a line to the capital; it is the Chinese mob that has opposed it and torn up the rails.

Another direct cause of the existing disturbances in China is unquestionably the inadequate and irregular pay of the official classes. A very large number of the provincial officials are what is termed expectants of office. They are attached to the local yamens without pay until some vacancy occurs, and how seldom this can occur is made clear from the fact that the unpaid officials largely exceed in numbers those who receive salaries. These persons have to live, and they can only do so by imposing on the credulity of the unfortunate petitioners or victims of Chinese justice. Various causes, not the least of which is the organisation of the secret societies, have tended to diminish these perquisites of late years. But a still more serious diminution of the pay of the permanent officials has been caused by the action of the Pekin Government. Their salaries have been, and are still, paid out of the revenue of the province in which they

are stationed. The revenues of each province are paid partly in cash and partly in kind; but, with the exception of the provinces containing a treaty port, the bulk of the revenue is paid in grain, and the viceroys control comparatively small sums of money. The bulk of their cash revenue was derived from the lekin levied at the provincial barriers on foreign goods before entering their jurisdiction, and it was out of this resource that the official salaries were mainly paid. But by the arrangement concluded a few years ago lekin is no longer leviable at the provincial barriers. It is paid at the same time as the import duty to the customs officer in the treaty port, and it no longer figures among the resources of the provincial governors, but as a unit increasing the revenue of the imperial government by rather more than one million sterling a year.

This benefit to the central government, to which it is fully entitled as keeping up the naval power and having the responsibility of the national defence of China, has only been obtained by inflicting an injury on the provincial administrations, and on the members of the civil service. The Pekin Government has acted on the assumption that the revenues of each province are sufficient without the aid of lekin to defray all the expenses of its administration, and it is highly probable that the assumption would be a sound one if those revenues were properly collected. But that is precisely what is not done. In most of the provinces the greater part of the revenue is wasted before it reaches the provincial treasury, and the irregularity with which the share due to the Imperial treasury at Pekin has been sent in was one of the chief causes that drove the executive in self-defence to take possession of the only provincial tax absolutely within its reach. A sounder system of finance and greater honesty in the collection of the taxes might restore the revenues of the provinces to as high a point as they reached when lekin was included, but any such improvement now seems extremely remote, and in the meantime the official class is suffering from a material diminution in its pay, which was never very liberal and always subject to fluctuation.

The discontent of the official class from the decline in the amount of salary received, and from the withdrawal of a tax which undoubtedly opened the door to many illicit perquisites, is a matter to which the Pekin Government cannot remain indifferent, unless it is prepared to see what is as yet a small trouble grow to such dimensions as to threaten its own existence. The Chinese Government will never exist on a firm

basis until it takes seriously in hand the task of reorganising its civil service, which is a perfect machine in theory, and which requires no alteration as to the mode of admission for its members nor in the excellent arrangements that regulate its numerous ranks. The only reform necessary is, on the one hand, to provide for the regular payment of the salaries to every official, high or low, and, on the other, to put down with a firm hand all forms of peculation and corruption. While stating this, it may be admitted that the Chinese Government does not at this moment possess the power to carry out so tremendous a reform as cleansing the Augean stable of the Chinese civil service would be, but its own safety should impel it to take some steps to mitigate the evil and allay the discontent arising from the withdrawal from the provinces of the control over lekin. The loss of salary has unquestionably aroused a spirit of dissatisfaction among the mandarins, and has tended to induce them to listen to allegations that undue preference has been shown to natives of certain provinces, and perhaps also to the promises of the secret societies with their stock panacea for all the evils of mankind. At such a moment as the present it behoves the emperor to make sure of the loyalty and devotion of his servants, and this he can only do by assigning part of the lekin tax to its old object of paying provincial salaries. At the present moment many of the officials are certainly negligent of their duty and perhaps meditating treason, but such a step would at once arouse their zeal and activity, and confirm their loyalty.

The discontent arising from these special causes has been further fanned by great calamities for which nature alone can be held responsible. The vagaries of the Hwangho, truly called from remote antiquity China's sorrow, have been more serious and fatal than ever during the last two years. Official after official has been disgraced, the control of the river which used to be the special province of one official has been subdivided among several officials, and still the river has followed its own erratic course, working a new channel to the sea and flooding a vast expanse of country, carrying away villages and inhabitants in its stride. But during the last two years still greater sufferings have been inflicted on the unfortunate peasants of the metropolitan province of Petchili, of Shantung, and of Kansuh by the severe floods which have occurred in those provinces. The loss was so great that a special subscription for the benefit of the sufferers was raised throughout the empire. In sterile pro-

vinces like Chekiang there has been almost a famine, and it is impossible to withhold some measure of sympathy from the unfortunate population which is suffering incredible hardships that it is not within the power of the executive to promptly relieve, and that are perhaps driving them into the arms of the secret societies, which do not possess the power any more than the Manchu dynasty to overcome the inflictions of nature. Enough has, however, been said to show that the real cause of the disturbances in China is human suffering from one cause or another. We see that badness of trade, insufficient crops, and desolating floods, added to discontent among the officials on account of their poor and irregular pay, have brought China to the eve of an insurrection, when political agitators feel able to talk openly of a change of dynasty, and of a general expulsion of foreigners. Whether the dynasty stand or fall, the foreign Governments are well able to take care of themselves, but if those responsible for Manchu authority act with common sense and the necessary promptitude there is no reason why they should not be equally triumphant.

The position of the foreign Powers in China, which has been steadily improving during the thirty years since the Treaty of Pekin, received last March what was supposed to be the last formality required to place their relations with China on the same basis as any other great country. The personal reception in audience of the ministers resident at Pekin by the Emperor Kwangsu, and the publication of his intention to receive them in a similar manner at the commencement of each Chinese new year, were regarded with lively satisfaction at the time and seemed of happy augury for the future. Before the ceremony was concluded there was, however, some unfavourable criticism of the proceedings, and those who knew China best were loudest in their complaint that the Chinese authorities had scored a sentimental success by placing the Treaty Powers on the same footing as the tributary states of Asia, for the ceremony of the audience was carried out in the Tse Kuang-ko, or hall for receiving the envoys of tributary nations. As the Chinese Emperor was only paid the same marks of respect as would be offered by ambassadors to any European potentate, the offensive ceremony of the kotow being of course excluded, the fact of the chamber being applied to a purpose that would be deemed derogatory by us would not seem of sufficient importance to excite comment were it not that we know how anxious Chinese officials are to distort matters that may

tend to exalt the dignity of the occupant of the Dragon throne. It is impossible to say how far success in what may seem a small point has not encouraged the Chinese to think that they may be equally successful in more important matters, and it has already been noticed that what it was hoped would prove the final surrender by the Chinese Government of the last privilege to which they laid claim —the invisibility of their sovereign—has been followed, instead of by increased celerity in the despatch of business, by greater delay in all diplomatic questions referred by the Tsungli Yamen to the Grand Council.

This has been specially noticeable in connexion with the publication of the imperial edict on the subject of the disturbances on the Yangtsekiang, which was dated June 12, and which had not been published at several of the scenes of outrage two months later. The edict itself was absolutely satisfactory in its phraseology, and was specially framed to protect the missionaries from attack, for it was therein stated that 'the propagation of the Christian religion by foreign missionaries is protected by treaty,* and 'by imperial edicts, issued from time to time to the provincial authorities for the protection of such missionaries, 'and for years past the relations which have existed between 'the Chinese and the foreign missionaries have been those 'of peace and goodwill.' But the delay in its notification throughout the empire led to much popular misapprehension as to the wishes of the supreme Government, and has undoubtedly been the cause of the further outbreaks at Ichang and other places. We might be disposed to think that this dilatoriness arose from a failure to perceive the gravity of the position, but that Li Hung Chang, to whom, as Grand Secretary, the emperor may, without any infraction of usage, refer any difficult question, has positively stated that the delay arose from the established rule that the emperor's edicts cannot be sent by telegraph, at the same time that he admitted the gravity of the situation. It is a fair argument that, if the most experienced minister in

* Article VIII. of the Treaty of Tientsin reads as follows: 'The Christian religion, as professed by Protestants or Roman Catholics, inculcates the practice of virtue, and teaches man to do as he would be done by. Persons teaching it or professing it, therefore, shall alike be entitled to the protection of the Chinese authorities, nor shall any such, peaceably pursuing their calling and not offending against the laws, be prosecuted or interfered with.'

the Chinese service is not yet aware of the importance of time, we can scarcely blame those nameless officials who think that events will wait on movements which have no regard for either telegraph or steam.

But the practical significance of the delay is that it has compelled the Treaty Powers to resort to far more vigorous action than would have been necessary if the Pekin executive had at once shown itself equal to the occasion; and it is worthy of notice that, however divided they are on other matters of foreign policy, they do seem to have the same views on the subject of China's responsibilities to the nations of the outer world, and on the necessity of holding her to their due performance. There is still a solidarity of interest and opinion among the Treaty Powers in China, which should convince the Chinese Government that any attempt to evade its treaty obligations would be futile, because it would be opposed by all civilised nations. At the same time, the objects of the policy of all the Powers cannot be pronounced the same once the common right to reside in and trade with China has been conceded. The interest of France in China is mainly sentimental and missionary. If France had not done so much to make China known in Europe by her literature, and if her religious missions were not the most successful in that country, it is quite conceivable that the French people would be absolutely indifferent to affairs in that empire, and that they would not stir a hand to help other nations to trade therein. On the other hand, the interest of England in China is mainly commercial, and, although there are many English missionaries in the Celestial Empire, the policy of this country has always been to discourage rather than encourage their efforts. With regard to the other Powers, Germany and the United States, although the energy of their representatives at Pekin, and the push of their contractors and speculators to obtain the right to construct the railways which are still altogether in the clouds, may occasionally bring them into prominence, have, strictly speaking, no decided interest in China beyond the natural wish that China should not again become a *patria clausa*. The same remark applies still more emphatically to Austria, Italy, Portugal, and Spain, all of which countries rank among the so-called Treaty Powers. There remains only Russia, who watches Chinese affairs with the most sustained vigilance, and whose interest in China is neither missionary nor commercial, but essentially political.

As Russia has so many ways of access to China from the land side, and as, moreover, the bulk of her trade with that country is carried on by Chinese subjects, it must be recognised that she is on quite a different footing from other States on the subject of the exclusiveness or non-exclusiveness of China. If the Treaties of Nankin and Tientsin were to be abrogated to-morrow, she might still hope that her advantageous position would prevent her suffering any material loss, although every foreigner was nominally excluded from China. The interest of Russia in China is twofold. There is, first of all, the possibility that China, by the aid of foreign officers and modern weapons, might be able to utilise its enormous supply of men to such an extent for military purposes as to make it extremely difficult and costly for Russia to maintain her position in Central Asia and Manchuria. From that point of view, it would not be altogether undesirable that China should cease to have communications with the outer world, and thus be left to her own resources. Secondly, there is the desire to acquire possession of frontier provinces, and especially of the *quasi*-independent kingdom of Corea. Russia's best occasion for gratifying this wish would be a general struggle between China and the Treaty Powers, which, while rendering China impotent to maintain her rights, would, at the same time, render the other Powers tolerant of an act of aggression, on the part of Russia, similar to that which placed maritime Manchuria in her hands during the Anglo-French march to Pekin. Whether the result of a foreign war be favourable to China or the foreign Powers, Russia may hope to be the gainer, and, alone among the Treaty States, she has only political objects to serve. The most formidable obstacle in the way of her realising her projects is the good sense of Li Hung Chang, who is most inclined to take English advice, and to utilise European weapons for the defence of Corea and the northern frontier, and therefore we have 'great 'Russian personages' inspiring the omniscient Paris correspondent of the 'Times' with the idea* that Li Hung Chang and the Tsungli Yamen are directing the revolution with the view of driving out the European element. The mother of the young emperor—that is, the widow of Prince Chun, and an entirely unknown personage—is said to be at the head of a movement which probably only exists in the imagination of certain excitable minds. The recent ten-

* 'Times' telegram of August 29, 1891.

dency of Chinese policy is entirely ignored, and the fact that the Western empress—the only woman with any power in China—and Li Hung Chang were advocates of the railway to Pekin, and humiliated by its rejection, is expected to count for nothing. There is no room for doubting that in this particular case we have a signal instance of Russia's diplomacy, and we cannot help seeing that her policy in China is not of the simple kind of those countries which have only commercial and missionary interests to safeguard.

Although the policy of Russia may be of a character to cause at some future time dissatisfaction to, and perhaps excite the opposition of, other Treaty Powers, there is nothing about it at present to lead Chinese statesmen to believe that the aggressiveness of Russia will provide them with an easy mode of extrication from their embarrassment. Russia will not dissociate herself from the rest of the world, nor will the favourable moment come for her to encroach on her neighbours until China is involved in a deplorable and most unwise struggle to withhold from foreigners the rights to which they are unquestionably entitled. The duty thrown on the Pekin Government is to obviate by prompt and vigorous measures all possibility of such a struggle taking place. Already they have aggravated their own troubles by delay. A resolute and energetic policy when the rioters on the Yangtsekiang first began to declare their unqualified hostility to foreigners, and to circulate atrocious lies about the missionaries, would have nipped the danger in the bud, and for not having taken decided steps when the Viceroy of the Two Kiang, Lui Kuny, was insulted by the mob in the streets of Nankin last year, the Chinese Government must be held in its own interests most blameworthy. The apathy of Chang Che Tung throughout the whole of this summer is also most reprehensible, and the emperor's advisers will be unduly blind to his dignity and authority if they do not visit it with the punishment it deserves. If it be true that Li Hung Chang himself has not shown that full appreciation of the need and wisdom of celerity which might be expected of one with his long experience of affairs, the explanation is more likely to be found in his relations with the supreme authorities at Pekin than in any uncertainty of his own opinion.

While doubt may be entertained of the attitude of individual members of the Chinese administration, there can be no question of the power of that administration if properly

used to crush any attempt at rebellion. To any persons who may not feel convinced on this point a perusal may be recommended of the interesting journal written by General Gordon as a description of the events of the great Taeping rebellion. That rising was attended with far more serious danger to the Pekin Government than any possible combination, short of Li Hung Chang's defection, could present at the present time. Yet his deliberate opinion was that it would have been put down by the Imperialists without his or any European aid.

'In conclusion, on looking back on the difficulties the Imperialists had to contend with for the last fifteen years, when they were, as it were, surprised by the rebellion, it will be granted that they have triumphed from their perseverance and determination, while, whatever may have been said respecting foreign assistance, any of our officials who have been thrown with the higher mandarins will own that they never saw any abasement in their requests of assistance—it frequently happened that we offered assistance before it was asked for, and thus, through our eagerness, the Chinese have, to a certain degree, made their own terms and maintained their independence. We must not expect gratitude from them. Nations are proverbially ungrateful, and it will only be by degrees that the Chinese will adopt reforms or innovations. The higher officials have the greatest difficulty in introducing them, and it would require a very brave official to bring in railways which would throw so many people out of work, and thence probably into rebellion. . . . Enough has been written to show that the Imperialists had the upper hand now, and would have, sooner or later, put down the rebellion of themselves.'

At the time of the Taeping rebellion it will be remembered that those who opposed the emperor were quite as well armed as those who supported his cause, and they enjoyed no inconsiderable share of foreign sympathy and support. But now the weight of evidence is entirely on the other side. The Imperialists are not merely the best equipped, but it has been made as clear as daylight that whatever the shortcomings and unpleasantness of diplomatic relations with the Pekin Government may be, they are preferable to any that could be established with the leaders of Chinese mobs, who declare that their only idea of policy is the expulsion of foreigners. But if the change is favourable to the Pekin executive on the ground of foreign sympathy and opinion, it is still more in its favour when we consider the immense improvement that has been brought about in its military, naval, and financial position. When the Anglo-French expedition returned from the capital, and left the Chinese to cope on their own resources with a rebel force which was

in absolute possession of Central China, and the outposts of which were within a short distance of Pekin, the emperor had no army worthy of the name with which to crush the Taepings. They were overcome by the levies raised by Tseng Kwofan and his two lieutenants, Tso Tsung Tang and Li Hung Chang, and the sinews of war were provided out of the customs of Shanghai. But now it is entirely different. The army of Petchili, which comprises the Black Flag force of Li Hung Chang and the Pekin Field Force, is a well-armed, well-trained, and thoroughly contented body of troops. There is no doubt of the loyalty of the former to the viceroy, or of the latter to the imperial family, and so long as they act in unison they could overcome any popular resistance. It may be admitted that both of these forces have been treated in the past with great tenderness, and that they have never been employed on active service, but their military efficiency is too well attested to allow of any doubt as to their capacity to cope with any bodies, however numerous, that the discontented Chinese might bring against them. Hitherto they have been exclusively occupied in guarding the forts at Taku and along the Peiho as well as the capital, but if a grave emergency were to arise in Central China we cannot doubt that these troops would be at once employed for the preservation of order and the assertion of the imperial authority.

Stronger as the central executive has become in a military sense, it has probably made still more remarkable progress in naval power during the last thirty years. Its existing ironclad fleet, with a full complement of torpedo boats, makes on paper a brave show, and, with proper handling, is entitled to a high place among the navies of the world. It is divided into two squadrons—that of the Yangtsekiang, under the command of Li Cheng Mow, and that of the North, under the immediate direction of Li Hung Chang. Of these the latter is the more formidable, and, while under the personal command of Admiral Laing, it was undoubtedly capable of active operations at sea. The Chinese Government has recently dispensed with his services, and it is to be feared that the efficiency of this fleet has already suffered from the loss of its European controller. The naval arsenals at Kiangnan, Port Arthur, and elsewhere are still provided with European instructors in the most responsible positions, and are quite capable of carrying out all the repairs on modern battle ships, and of providing the necessary *matériel*, while several ironclads

have been turned out from the Chinese shipbuilding yards. Although the Yangtse squadron periodically patrols the Yangtsekiang up to Hankow, the northern squadron rarely leaves the Gulf of Petchili, and quite as much care has been shown in nursing it as the land forces round the capital. But here, again, we must not assume that because they are not used they are useless. The father of Frederick the Great took the greatest care of his gigantic grenadiers, but that did not prevent their winning the battle of Mollwitz. In the same way, we do not doubt that the new army and navy of China would be able to render a very good account of any ordinary opponent, and that no rebel force would have the least chance of coping with it. The Chinese Government is also stronger in the possession of an increased cash revenue, which now amounts to not less than five million sterling a year, and it should not be altogether disregarded that it now has far more rapid means of obtaining information which should, at least, enable it to take earlier measures, and to direct its operations against the proper quarter.

Considering all these facts, it would be opposed to the balance of evidence, and to reason, to jump to the conclusion that because a secret society has proclaimed its intention to depose the Manchus, and because there are grave disturbances in Central China, we are on the eve of a change of dynasty. The very violence of the programme of the disaffected will in itself conduce to the defeat of their own plans. It has not merely alienated the sympathy of foreigners, but it has compelled their Governments to bring the strongest possible pressure on the Pekin authorities, in order that the disturbances may be terminated, and their authors duly punished. If the Pekin authorities are lax in the matter, it is quite clear that their proper work will be undertaken and carried out by the naval and military forces of the foreign Powers, who will in turn exact from them a heavy pecuniary indemnity and some adequate, if humiliating, reparation for the breach of treaty. But they will show greater wisdom, and a more correct appreciation of their own situation, if they discharge their own duties, and convince their subjects that they are resolved not only to uphold the emperor's authority, but also to protect the lives and property of foreign missionaries and merchants. It is impossible for us, who are remote from the scene, to prescribe what should be done, but the dismissal of Chang Che Tung and the despatch of a portion of the northern squadron

to the Yangtsekiang would be some earnest of its serious intention to grapple with the difficulty.

The best policy for the Treaty Powers beyond inciting the Government to discharge its duties is a matter of far greater difficulty. On the one hand, they are bound to protect the lives of their subjects and the interests of their respective nations, and in discharging this duty the apathy of the Chinese Government may drive them to reprisals and to take up a position of open hostility. On the other hand, we cannot help seeing that a central government in China is essential if relations are to be maintained with the Chinese people with any degree of harmony and without constant friction, and the idea that the lawless bands of Hunan would provide a more respectable government than that at Pekin needs only expression to be scouted. There is a possibility that the emperor's advisers realise this latter fact as clearly as we do, and that they are disposed to believe that we will do their work for them and save them any serious trouble. Such an opinion would certainly prove very costly to China, and might easily be carried too far. The Manchu dynasty is at present safe enough, no doubt, against any Chinese revolt; but if it were humiliated in the field by another foreign war, there is no knowing how seriously its position might be compromised. Nor should it be overlooked that, while the present disturbers of China's peace have repelled the sympathy of any foreigners who might have thought that a new régime at Pekin would be more businesslike and practical, the Manchu executive can as easily alienate our goodwill by adopting an impossible attitude in the present crisis. The delays which were excusable when there were several rebellions in progress throughout the country, and when the military resources of the Empire were insignificant, are not to be forgiven now that the State is free from internal trouble, and that it possesses a large and well-trained army and navy. If China is to retain the goodwill of the rest of the world, she must stifle the incipient signs of rebellion that are prevalent, and prove that she is resolved to enforce the tranquillity and security for foreigners which she has guaranteed by treaty, and which it is to her own interest to maintain. If the Manchu dynasty has enemies, it has certainly no better way of baffling them, and of prolonging its own existence, than by proving that it is determined to uphold the treaties and to facilitate the growth of commercial intercourse between China and the other countries of the world.

ART. IX.—1. *Rosbach and Jena.* By Baron COLMAR VON DER GOLTZ.

2. *Field-Marshal von Moltke.* By Professor W. MÜLLER.

3. *Le Maréchal de Moltke Organisateur et Stratège.* By General LEWAL. 'Journal des Sciences Militaires.' Paris: May 1891.

4. *Collected Works of Count von Moltke.* Vol. III. Berlin: 1891.

5. *Great Commanders of Modern Times.* By W. O'CONNOR MORRIS. London: 1891.

AMONG the many marvels which history presents, few are more striking than the growth of the German empire. As from a village on the Tiber sprang the genius, the national characteristics—what term will best express the indefinable something?—which after long years led to the sovereignty of the known world, so in the electorate of Brandenburg or the unimportant duchy of Prussia lay the germ destined to generate the greatest military power of the present age. In one respect there is a certain resemblance between these two vast evolutions. The early progress was slow, the later stage relatively rapid. Five centuries elapsed before the Roman people became undisputed masters of lower Italy. Little more than one century later they dominated the civilised world. Between the union of Brandenburg with the small province of Prussia and Sadowa lie 250 years, marked by great wars and varying fortunes; but, five years after Sadowa, the genius of Prussia had achieved European pre-eminence, driven France back from the Rhine, and created a powerful empire, stretching from Jutland to Lake Constance, from the eastern verge of Holland to the Russian frontier. Even now it may be doubted whether the process of expansion and unification has ended, or whether the whole German-speaking peoples of Europe may not be welded into one solid mass. The territory of the German empire of to-day does not nearly equal in area that ruled by Charles V.; but the one represents a powerful and united nation wielding an army which science has perfected, while the other was an aggregate of States possessing no real cohesion and incapable of combined action.

Astronomers who watch the sun's disc tell us of the stupendous convulsions which occur from time to time in the

photosphere. A small spot suddenly appears, increases till it is large enough to engulf our world, and then, sometimes gradually, sometimes with extreme rapidity, the mountainous flame-waves sweep over it, and it is gone. Others, looking back into the dim past of the universe, see in the fragments of silver haze, which we call nebulas, the potentiality of worlds yet to come. For some reason unknown a condensation of matter now spread over countless leagues of stellar space will arise, and round this nucleus, in the course of ages, a habitable sphere may be formed. Such are the phenomena which history records in miniature in the changing map of Europe.

Consider for a moment the great groupings of nations which have arisen in the past fifteen centuries. Before A.D. 500 the Roman empire had split into two portions, of which only the eastern half remained. The East Goths had swept far down into the Italian Peninsula, the West Goths ranged over southern France and the greater part of Spain. Some 250 years later came a great Frankish grouping in the west, extending to the Pyrenees on the south, and far into central Europe on the east. Swiftly the scene changes, and the Carlovingian monarchy is sundered and shrunk, while the Moors overrun the Spanish Peninsula and the Bulgarians pass the Danube and press down nearly to Constantinople, absorbing a great portion of the east Roman empire. By the year 1000 a new grouping has arisen in central Europe —the Holy Roman Empire—destined to exercise a powerful influence over the German language and race. In the south-east the decaying Roman power retires before a wave of Mahomedan invasion, which by 1150 has swept over Asia Minor nearly to the Bosphorus; but, in the south-west, the Moors have been forced back before the kingdoms of Castile and Arragon. By the middle of the fifteenth century, the Moorish power in Europe has shrunk to the kingdom of Granada, but in the east the advancing Osmanli have reached the banks of the Danube. Venice, Florence, and Genoa are vigorous republics, and the first holds Cyprus, Crete, and many of the isles of Greece, while the last owns Corsica and Lemnos. The central grouping of the German race remains, and a real France has long assumed form. The last foothold of the Moor in Europe is soon destroyed, but the Turk extends his sway far beyond the Danube, overruns Hungary, and reaches Vienna in 1683.

Meanwhile, in the early part of the sixteenth century, there is a division of the great empire of Charles V. into ten

provinces, and in this division appear the germs of a Prussia and a Savoy. From it also is evolved later the Austrian empire, which, till 1866, claimed the headship of the German races. But another great grouping has previously arisen in east central Europe—the kingdom of Poland—destined for a time to stretch from the Dniester to the Bay of Riga, from the Dnieper nearly to the Oder, and then, after successive partitions in 1772, 1793, and 1795, for ever to disappear.

The year 1648 brought the treaty of Westphalia, which added greatly to the Brandenburg electorate, now beginning to be a force in Europe. Meanwhile many changes of the map had occurred since the days of Charles V. Austria had obtained a western frontier, differing little from that of to-day; but, though just reaching the Adriatic at Trieste, was as yet excluded from Istria and the long stretch of coast-line to the south-east, which still belonged to the Venetian republic. On the north, however, Silesia formed part of the Austrian grouping; while, on the east, the Turks, still advancing, held the greater part of modern Hungary as far as Komorn, on the Upper Danube.

The seventy years following the treaty of Westphalia brought many great wars which left their impress on the map. The Great Elector of Brandenburg had, in 1688, bequeathed to his son, the first King of Prussia, a dominion extending from the Oder to the Rhine, and Frederic William I., who succeeded to the throne in 1713, formed the army which Frederic the Great learned to wield with power. Austria had gained the Netherlands, Naples, and Sicily; France had reached the Swiss frontier and the Rhine by the absorption of Franche Comté and Elsass, while in the north she had obtained Artois. The Turks had been driven to the southern bank of the Danube, and Peter the Great had laid the foundations of the Russian empire. The war of the Austrian Succession on the death of Charles VI. gave Silesia and Glatz to Prussia, and Frederic, having failed in his attempt to extend his territory into Northern Bohemia, devoted the following years to preparations for a further struggle. The Seven Years' War, which broke out in 1756, and involved fighting by land and sea all over the world, arose directly from the determination of Austria to check the growing strength of her new rival to the dominion of Germany. In spite of the great sacrifices and the terrible suffering inflicted on Prussia by this war, the aims long cherished by her rulers suffered no check. The European position of the

kingdom was secured, and the reputation won by the Prussian army received practical recognition soon afterwards in the addition of two provinces as part of the spoils of Poland, while Frederic was able to pose as the champion of the rights of the minor German States when the question of the Bavarian succession arose. The 'Potato War' of 1778, though inglorious from the military point of view, left Prussia with new claims to that leadership of Germany towards which the policy of her rulers had been steadily directed; and this policy received fresh illustration in the unscrupulous second partition of Poland in 1793, which gave to Frederic William II. the control of the mouths of the Vistula.

The map of Europe was torn into shreds by the resistless wave which, receiving its impulse from the French Revolution, reached its culminating point in 1812. Prussia, defeated at Jena in 1806 and abandoned by Russia in 1807, in spite of the support furnished by her troops on the field of Eylau, was reduced to a state of vassalage. The French empire expanded its boundaries to the Rhine from Basel to Wesel, included Holland, extended across the Elbe, reaching the Baltic at Lübeck, and stretched down the western side of the Italian Peninsula beyond Rome. The wave had spent itself and swiftly recoiled. In 1815 the French Rhine frontier only extended as far north as the Lauter. Prussia, though shorn of the larger portion of her Polish spoils, received part of Saxony and the Rhine provinces; while for the first time the Russian frontier was protruded far into central Europe. The German Bund—the *magnum opus* of the Congress of Vienna—embracing Prussia and Austria, together with a dozen minor kingdoms and duchies, dragged on its artificial existence for nearly fifty years; but the Holstein war of 1864 quickly led to the final struggle between Prussia and Austria, by which the hegemony of Germany was decided. The Franco-German war produced changes in the map small in comparison with those which had gone before; but the German race took upon itself a new grouping. The electorate of Brandenburg had expanded into the German empire.

In searching for the causes which brought about this great evolution, one fact at least stands out clearly. 'Two 'prudent marriages,' wrote Mr. Motley, 'made by Austrian 'archdukes within twenty years, have altered the face of 'the earth.' The career of Prussia owed nothing to such adventitious aids; and that career, from first to last, from

the time of the Great Elector to the assumption of the imperial title at Versailles, affords a striking refutation of the theory that the force of individual character can play only a limited part in determining the fate of nations. Full weight must be given to the genius of a people which impressed its stamp so deeply upon a territory largely Sclav, to the long wars which brought terrible suffering upon the helpless minor States, to the craving which makes for a defined nationality. But the headship of the German races achieved by Prussia must, as was pointed out in this Journal* before France had been crushed, be mainly attributed to the 'unchangeable 'purpose shown by the rulers of Prussia.' The natural forces were all ready to come into play; yet they might have vainly spent themselves but for the 'persistent family 'purpose handed down from father to son in a reigning 'house,' which for 250 years, alike in victory and defeat, in honour and dishonour, has maintained a single steadfast aim.

The German empire of to-day is thus largely a dynastic creation. A dynasty, however, requires efficient instruments for carrying out its set purposes, and such instruments the Hohenzollerns have almost always had at command. Their greatest reverses, the most serious checks sustained by their vaulting ambitions, may be traced to a neglect to use the genius which lay ready to their hands. 'My ancestors,' declared the present German emperor in presence of the Education Conference, 'with their fingers on the pulse of 'time, have ever kept a look out for what might come to 'pass, and have thus remained at the head of the movement 'which they determined to direct.' These proud words need qualification. Frederic the Great, in his self-reliance, made grave mistakes; but in the days of his full vigour he well knew how to use the great soldiers who commanded under him. His successor, Frederic William II., although he possessed the discernment to rescue Blücher from oblivion as a Pomeranian squire, proved in 1792 that he had lost touch with the national requirements. The fiasco of Valmy gave the first real impulse to the then inchoate armies of republican France, and launched them on their wild career of conquest; while the military prestige of Prussia suffered a blow the effects of which were not obliterated till Waterloo.

Frederic William III. fell far short of the universal prescience now claimed for the dynasty, and under his rule

* October 1866.

Prussia, degraded by Napoleon before she was conquered, and driven at last to declare war too late—or too soon—suffered the most complete overthrow which has ever befallen a great military people. The popular ideas of the causes which led to Jena and Auerstadt have passed into a hundred histories, and are perhaps too deeply rooted to be easily shaken. The system of Frederic the Great was worshipped as a fetish. Its narrowness of conception and tactical rigidity proved hopelessly unsuited to the new conditions. The military organisation of Prussia rested on the insecure basis of the prestige of bygone wars. The generals were a set of incapables. How far these views are correct, and how far they are wholly inadequate to explain the catastrophe, the admirable historical study of Baron Colmar von der Goltz plainly shows. The glamour of the campaign of 1870–71 has dazzled the imagination of military writers, and produced a tendency to seek in the story of the overthrow of France the whole teaching of war. The causes of victory or defeat lie deeper than tactical formations, breech-loading rifles, or the massing of artillery, and in some respects the period of Prussia's greatest reverses supplies more valuable lessons than that of her triumphs.

Baron von der Goltz is no mere historian of battles, carried away by details often of no possible consequence, but an earnest student of causes with a wide grasp and a true sense of proportion. After discussing at length the qualifications of the generals who led their armies to disaster in 1806, he discards the popular estimate of their capacity. 'We may, on the contrary, affirm that in 1806 the Prussian 'army had at its head the best generals it had ever possessed.' One marked difference, however, divided the generals of Frederic William III. from those of Napoleon. The Duke of Brunswick was 71 years old; Prince Hohenlohe, 60; and among subordinate commanders were men of 68, 70, and 74. Lefebvre, the oldest French general, was barely 51; Augereau, 48; Bernadotte, 42; Napoleon, Ney, Soult, and Lannes, 37; Murat only 35. Excepting for the intervention in Holland in 1787, and the Duke of Brunswick's ill-starred invasion of Champagne in 1792, the Prussian army—like that of Great Britain in 1854—had suffered from a long peace, one of the results in each case being a certain disbelief in young commanders. Von der Decken, writing in 1798 under the title 'Is it necessary that we should only have young generals?' decided the question in the negative; and in the British

army to-day an officer of the same age as that of Napoleon or Murat at Jena may find his energies confined to the command of a company whatever his capacity. The organisation of the Prussian army in 1806 was by no means exceptionally bad. Its drill was perfect. Its 'review 'manœuvres' were frequent and faultlessly executed. Yet, like the British army in 1854, and to a less extent to-day, it was not trained for war, and its so-called manœuvres were positively harmful. 'What produces the most painful im-'pression upon me,' wrote Clausewitz, 'is to see that 'these pretences of fighting, studied in advance, foreseen 'and explained in their least details, and executed at a 'named point, were practised by the most eminent men in 'the army . . . with a seriousness which absorbed their 'whole existence.' The tactical deficiencies which have been frequently pointed out cannot with any justice be ascribed to the system of Frederic the Great, whose military testament of 1768 forestalled to a great extent the innovations of Napoleon. A numerous artillery, the employment of cavalry in masses of forty to fifty squadrons, clouds of skirmishers followed up by the determined onslaught of compact bodies—all were laid down by the victor of Rosbach as the coming requirements. The spirit of Frederic no longer dwelt with the Prussian army, however; only 'the letter 'which killeth' remained.

The decadence of Prussia at the beginning of the century was not merely military, but national. Ignorance and arrogance alike characterised the utterances of the period. In spite of the obvious danger, the army was reduced to a peace footing in January 1806. As late as August 30 no hint of any realisation of the extreme gravity of the situation appears in a Berlin paper, which, however, was able to find a place for the story of an Englishman riding on a cow at Margate, and for the objections of the Bishop of Palermo to the Highland costume worn by British troops in Sicily. So great was the baseless confidence felt in some quarters, that a Prussian colonel was able to publicly declare, 'I 'regret that the brave Prussians carry swords and muskets; 'clubs would suffice to chase these dogs of French from the 'country.' No newspaper of the Boulevards in 1870 equalled the arrogance of this speech.

The decadence of the nation, which Baron von der Goltz ably traces, received its most striking illustration after Jena had been fought and lost. Half the population acquiesced in the French occupation with all its gross indignities. A

great portion of the Berlin press flung away every shred of patriotism, and General Hulin, the French governor of the capital, was even obliged, out of sympathy for the citizens, to moderate the zeal of their own municipal officers, self-constituted lacqueys of the conqueror. In truth, the causes of Jena lay far deeper than any mere military pedantry or tactical ineptitude. 'It is incontestable,' writes the same author, 'that the spirit of the age was the principal cause of 'the feebleness of the army.' All the splendid recuperative power and noble patriotism subsequently shown cannot obscure the fact that in the period immediately following Jena Prussia gave proofs of a national demoralisation of which France, in spite of crushing disaster, stood acquitted in 1871. Unquestionably, Frederic William III. must have lost touch of 'the pulse of time' prior to 1806, for warning was not wanting. Genius in abundance was available which might have saved the country. The views of the Prussian officer Lecoq on the state of the French army were never made known, and proved unavailing, as under Napoleon III. were the now celebrated reports of Colonel Stoffel. The Berlin War Office in 1806, like that of Paris in 1870 and of Pall Mall to-day, was well provided with pigeon-holes. The eminent tactician Bulow, Prussian officer, actor, dealer in glass, writer, prisoner in Berlin, dying miserably at Riga, formed a true estimate of the armed strength of France. 'I am convinced,' he wrote, 'that France is destined to have 'the sovereignty.' Mercilessly he condemned the echelon tactics subsequently employed at Jena. 'These wretched 'echelons are only petty artifices to secure being beaten in 'detail.' 'Some armies,' he pointed out, 'are more susceptible 'of reforms than others; they are those whose ancient glories 'are not bound up with ancient prejudices.' Pleading for liberty of speech, he asserted that 'where this liberty does not 'exist it quickly comes to pass that ideas fail.' Of radical military reformers there was indeed no end. In 1800 Von der Decken contended stoutly for the principle of universal service, and brought forward an elaborate scheme embodying his views. In 1803 Knesebeck published his 'Ideas on the 'Formation of a National Reserve,' embracing the principle of short service and a large training of men. Even a working man, Köhler by name, who gained his living by 'carting stones 'and sand,' came forward with a project of army reorganisation. The voice of Scharnhorst, greatest of all, pleaded for reforms, and struck the true note in prophetic words: 'We 'have arrived at appreciating the art of war more highly

'than the military virtues. It is this which has been the 'ruin of peoples in all ages. Courage, the spirit of sacrifice, 'perseverance, are the bases of the independence of a nation. 'As soon as these virtues no longer make our hearts beat, 'we are already lost, even at a time of great victories.' In troop leading and in superior direction he considered the French to be superior to the Prussians, and for this reason he demanded that only men of talent and action should ever be placed at the head of divisions, brigades, and regiments. 'Such qualities alone should confer the right to exalted 'positions, for by their nature they cannot be made the re-'compense of long service. The choice ought to be based 'not on services rendered, but on services to be rendered.' Later military literature has produced nothing superior to this remarkable memorandum, and Baron von der Goltz may well say that the military revival of Prussia was 'the fruit 'not of six years, but of twenty-six years,' of which the greatest part lay hid till brought to light by the cleansing fires of Jena.

The potency of her army has at all times been the gauge of the European position of Prussia, and the army has drawn its inspiration either directly from the throne, as in the days of Frederic the Great and his father, or indirectly from the advisers whom the monarch selected. But the efficiency of an army is bound up with the spirit of the nation, on whose patriotism, intelligence, and self-sacrifice its very existence depends. Thus the history of the years which followed after Jena, the years which led the Prussian army from utter disaster at the hands of Napoleon to a single-handed overthrow of France in 1870–71, involves much more than a mere military revival. The inherent qualities of the German race made possible the far-reaching reforms of Stein and Scharnhorst. The people accorded more than acquiescence to the organic law of September 3, 1814, by which the principle of universal service was established. There is something admirable in the steady, quiet determination with which Prussia in the days of her humiliation set about the work of military and national regeneration, which carried her troops to Paris in 1814 and again in the following year. For nearly fifty years after Waterloo the army had no experience of real war; but grave defects were manifested in the mobilisations of 1850, 1854, and 1859, which the keen insight of the military advisers of the crown was quick to recognise. Prussia did not wait for disaster before applying the remedies, and the year 1860 saw great changes and

augmentations sternly carried out in face of bitter opposition—changes subsequently justified on the plains of Bohemia.

Meanwhile, in 1857, the Prince of Prussia, subsequently first German emperor, assumed the reins of government; and at the same time an appointment was made which was destined to exercise an enormous influence over the Prussian army. The belief widely prevalent in this country that any officer of suitable rank is fit for any post has, happily for her army, no existence in Prussia, and the cynical remark of Lord Melbourne, that anyone is fit for any office which he has interest enough to obtain, could not have been made by any Prussian statesman. The military pre-eminence of Germany has been achieved by the agency of a comparatively small group of men, whom the genius of the Hohenzollerns has enabled them to select—and to trust.

On October 29, 1857, at General von Manteuffel's suggestion, Major-General von Moltke assumed the direction of the general staff of the army. In 1859, General von Roon became Minister of War, and in 1863 Count Bismarck, exambassador at St. Petersburg, was appointed Foreign Minster and President of the Council. 'These men together 'formed a trio which all the world might envy,' states Professor Müller, and at least it will be admitted that the combination was fraught with vast issues. The most thorough believer in the British doctrine of equality would scarcely maintain that to Prussia and to Europe it was a matter of indifference which of the many men of suitable rank occupied these most important posts.

In peace time, the work of a Chief of the Staff is known but to few. An army badly administered is quick to perceive that something is wrong with the directing brain; but, in proportion as the machinery works smoothly, the inevitable tendency is to regard the administration as a matter of course, and to forget alike the arduous labour and the creative genius by which alone the result can be attained. In war all eyes are turned upon the executive officers, the commanders of armies, under whom battles are lost or won. Thus, till 1866, the name of Von Moltke was scarcely known outside of Prussia, and the translator of his great work on the Russo-Turkish campaigns of 1828 and 1829 informed the world in 1854 that he was 'now dead.' The 'Letters 'on the East,' written between 1835 and 1839, and published in 1841, were not translated into French until 1872; by which date it had been discovered that the author was

'un observateur comme il y en a peu, un esprit que tout intéresse et qui sait se rendre compte de tout. . . . Il serait assurément difficile de rencontrer un volume qui témoignât d'une intelligence plus ouverte et plus fournie, et d'un plus vaste ensemble de connaissances parfaitement assimilées. Le nom de l'auteur' (added M. Nefftzer) 'crée un intérêt de plus, intérêt douloureux pour nous, mais d'un douleur qu'il faut surmonter quand il s'agit de s'instruire.'

The fame of the successful soldier thus shed its lustre on the writer of more than thirty years previously.

The life of the man who, silently and without showing the faintest trace of mere personal ambition, has left so deep an impression upon the imagination of the age, remains to be written. His lifework can be traced in the fabric of the German army; his genius for the conduct of war can be studied in its campaigns. As a writer we can fairly judge him by the letters from the East, from Russia, and from Paris; and by the history of the Russo-Turkish campaign, the sketches of Poland, Holland, and Belgium, and the *précis* of the 1870–1 campaign just published. His speeches in the Reichstag, though rare and generally devoted to the military questions with which his life was bound, serve to throw a sidelight upon the character of the man. But of his earlier days, his home life, and the occupations of his few leisure hours we as yet know little.

Helmuth von Moltke—like Blücher, a Mecklenberger—was born in the year of Marengo, and as a child of six witnessed the sacking of Lübeck by the French troops after Jena. In 1811 his father moved to Copenhagen, where, later, the boy was sent to the military academy. Many years afterwards he still retained a bitter memory of his young life in the Danish capital.

'Without friends or acquaintances,' he wrote in 1866, 'we passed a thoroughly joyless childhood. We were treated with rigour, even with harshness. . . . The only good I ever received from this treatment was that I became well accustomed to every sort of privation.'

Truly, he may be said to have 'graduated in misery's col-'lege.' After a six years' course at the academy, he headed the list in the examination of 1818, and in 1819 he was gazetted to an infantry regiment. Dissatisfied with the career offered by the Danish army, and anxious to give his services to his native land, Von Moltke, in 1822, went to Berlin, where he seems to have lived a life of quiet study. After a year spent as head of the 'somewhat disorderly mili-'tary school' at Frankfort, he was attached to the topographical department of the staff under General von Müffling.

From 1835 to 1839 his services were lent to the Sultan, and he took part in the disastrous campaign in Asia Minor against Ibrahim Pasha. In 1841 the collected letters from the East were published, as well as many maps, the results of surveys made in Turkey. Four years later Major von Moltke became adjutant to Prince Henry of Prussia, then an invalid living in Rome. Here he witnessed the enthusiasm attending the accession of Pio Nono, and, returning shortly afterwards, significantly remarked: 'I saw how 'quickly the enthusiasm had subsided as soon as the new 'pope had convinced himself that he would have to halt 'upon the liberal paths he had chosen.' Two books were the literary result of his life in Italy. For seven years, commencing in 1848, he served at Magdeburg as chief of the staff of the 4th Army Corps, then commanded by the future first German Emperor. A lifelong friendship dates from this period, of which the first public sign was the appointment of Von Moltke as equerry to the Crown Prince of Prussia, in attendance upon whom he visited St. Petersburg, Paris, and London. In 1857 he assumed the direction of the general staff, and his life entered upon a far wider sphere. The reorganisation of the army was completed in 1860, and in 1863 Von Moltke drew up the plan of operations of his first campaign. After the storming of Düppel he accompanied the King to Schleswig, and strongly urged the occupation of the islands of Alsen and Fünen as the necessary means of securing a decisive result.

For a Prussian officer of this period, the career briefly sketched above was most exceptionally varied. To a keen observer, whom nothing seems to have escaped, the opportunities thus presented were invaluable. Von Moltke had been called upon to assist in a reorganisation of the Turkish army and the rehabilitation of the defences of the country. His practical experience of surveying in wild countries had been great. In Asia Minor he had accompanied the hapless force of Hafiz Pasha to the ruin which he foresaw, but was powerless to avert.

The whole story of the lost battle, in which some of the experiences of Baker Pasha in 1877 were anticipated, is vividly told in the 'Letters on the East.' The keen-eyed Prussian officer, instantly detecting a turning movement on the part of Ibrahim's force, urged a general attack, which, however, 'was reduced to an insignificant demonstration with our 'wretched cavalry.' The movement successfully accomplished by the enemy, he at once advised a retirement to

Birardchik. 'This position had the great evil, according to 'European principles, of being without a line of retreat; 'after all that I had seen, this circumstance appeared to my 'eyes its greatest advantage. Everyone . . . would see that 'it was necessary to hold on or perish.' Hafiz, however, 'declared that it was a dishonour to retire; he also feared 'that Birardchik was too strong; the enemy would not dare 'to attack us,' &c. Von Moltke spoke his mind 'in the 'most formal and frank manner in the presence of the 'superior officers of the army,' and the Pasha agreed to follow his advice. No orders were issued, however, and an hour later he found Hafiz surrounded by his Mollahs. He had already changed his mind. 'The cause of the Sultan 'was just: Allah would come to his aid . . . I reminded 'him that the next day, when the sun again set behind these 'mountains, he would probably be without an army; all was 'in vain!' At nightfall Von Moltke made a last fruitless appeal, and then, resigning his appointment as adviser, he set himself to post the troops for the coming fight. The rout of the following day was complete. 'In a few minutes 'we had scarcely any battalions whose courage had not been 'shaken by their losses.' On the left wing 'almost all the 'battalions were at prayer, with their hands above their 'heads—a manœuvre executed under the orders of the com- 'mandant.' The Pasha himself carried 'the colours of a 'landwehr battalion; but the battalion did not follow him. '. . . The infantry fired into the air at immense ranges, the 'cavalry dispersed, and soon all broke up.'

Such were Moltke's first experiences of war. In a striking passage General Lewal contrasts the slow promotion, the unnoticed and unrewarded years of toil which the great German uncomplainingly endured, with the high rank and reputation easily won by French officers of the period. 'While this major laboured in Berlin without great recom- 'pense, high-sounding reputations, prodigious promotions 'were being won in Algeria. Men of the same age were 'attaining the highest rank, and, later, fate will bring these 'brilliant generals face to face with this persevering old 'Prussian major, in one of those immense convulsions in 'which the French army will go under.' Von Moltke's *quasi*-Algerian experiences were brief, and brought him no honours; but unquestionably they were not thrown away on a mind capable of estimating them at their true value. It was something to have taken part in this rough and desultory warfare, to have led reconnaissances, posted troops for

battle, foreseen and striven to avert defeat. 'I perceived,' he writes, 'that in war, spirit replaces much science.' There is something almost grotesque in the picture of the future organiser of the German army throwing himself with characteristic earnestness into the siege of a Kurdish stronghold. 'When I saw the imposing castle on a formidable height '. . . I could not help thinking that forty resolute men 'would here suffice for a very long resistance.' Like Napoleon, when the progress of his army was arrested by the little mountain fort of Bard, Von Moltke instantly grasped the situation. Guns must be taken to the top of an adjoining rocky hill from which the castle was commanded. After great labour this work was accomplished; but the shooting proved to be indifferent, and Von Moltke undertook a night reconnaissance, crawling on his hands and knees over the rocks in order to choose a place to begin mining. 'As for the miner, you must picture an honest stonecutter, 'a poor *rayah*, who was forced to exercise his peaceful trade 'for this warlike object.' The description of the whole affair is admirable. It is just sufficiently serious, but shows all through that the writer exactly gauged the military significance of the operations in which he took an active part. A comparison between these letters and the grandiloquent despatches which have been written with regard to other operations of the same class involuntarily suggests itself.

'Algerian' warfare has, however, a certain educational value, provided that the sense of proportion is never lost or blunted, and Von Moltke's experiences in Asia Minor were unquestionably not without their effect on his subsequent career. The estimate of him as a thinker rather than a man of action, 'un industriel militaire' rather than a soldier, needs much qualification. As an expert surveyor in a country as wild as Afghanistan, and as a staff officer with a loose irregular force, he abundantly proved his readiness of resource and genius for adventure.

No army in the world contains better fighting material than that of Turkey. The nizam is a soldier to the manner born, brave, patient, hardy, and docile. At Kars and at Plevna he not merely showed a tenacity almost unrivalled, but here and there gave signs of the impetuosity and dash which are associated with the best traditions of France. The national conditions of Turkey, however, are fatal to the efficiency of her army, and the Russian war of 1877–8 served to illustrate its weakness in every phase. The fates were not unpropitious; Allah did not frown upon the cause of the

Crescent; the enemy committed a series of blunders which should have entailed disaster: but unity of purpose—even ordinary loyalty—did not exist among the Turkish commanders. The fleeting opportunities were lost, and the Russians, having won time to bring up reinforcements and to learn the lessons of war, irresistibly swept down to San Stefano.

In his admirable work on the Russo-Turkish war of 1828-9, Von Moltke showed how completely he had grasped the inherent disabilities of the Turkish army. Sultan Mahmud had none of the advantages with which William I. of Prussia was surrounded. 'Among his own followers 'he found no one enlightened man to aid him with 'counsel . . . There was an utter lack of intelligent native 'officers, and prejudice stood in the way of the employment 'of foreigners. . . . The splendid appearance, the beautiful 'arms, the reckless bravery of the former Moslem horde had 'disappeared; but yet this new army had one quality which 'placed it above the numerous host which in earlier times the 'Porte could summon to the field—it obeyed.' Nearly fifty years were to elapse before Russia and Turkey would again engage in a single-handed contest. One of the conditions which Von Moltke laid down as a certain feature of the next struggle—'that the Russian fleet in the Black Sea . . . 'will always be superior to the Turkish'—was not then fulfilled. He further pointed out that, taught by bitter experience, 'the Russians in any future war will probably 'advance into Bulgaria with much larger forces.' But the Russian general staff in 1877 clearly showed that they had never really studied the reasoned criticism of the earlier campaign which came from the pen of the 'ancien major 'persévérant.' With equal truth it may be said that the plain teaching of this great work, and the just estimate presented of the Russian soldiery, was thrown away upon the British War Office in 1854. The indefatigable Prussian had even provided important information as to the climate and military conditions of the Crimea, which was translated by a British officer on the eve of his departure to the East, and forwarded to the authorities who affected to conduct the war. 'But they would not be warned,' he sadly wrote from the camp of Balaclava, after witnessing the terrible sufferings inflicted upon the army by the ignorance and incapacity of its administration.

The history of the Russo-Turkish war, with its admirable lucidity, careful analysis and scrupulous attention to detail, added considerably to Von Moltke's reputation. In Prussia

the truth of the saying of Don Quixote, that 'the sword hath 'never blunted the pen, nor the pen the sword,' has long been admitted. In style and arrangement the work foreshadows the great staff histories, now recognised models of their kind, in which the deeds of the German army have found an enduring monument. These histories, containing a mine of wealth for the military student for all time, unquestionably owe their inspiration to the great Chief of the Staff, who guided, if he did not take a large personal share in, their preparation.

While the strategic genius of Von Moltke has been variously estimated, there can be but one judgement as to his literary faculty. His rare gifts as a military historian are beyond question; as a letter writer, regarded in some aspects, he has few equals. Moreover, the letters attest the man. Here is no pedant absorbed in a single science; no hard, narrow soul in which things non-military found no resting place. His keen observation noted all which passed before it. The toilettes of the ladies of the Russian court are described in fullest detail and with evident accuracy, as calculated to interest his wife. Yet, as M. Marchand truly remarks,* 'Ces lettres témoignent une fois de plus des 'qualités sérieuses qui sont la force de nos ennemis.' For in the midst of a vivid word-picture of the view from his window, Von Moltke pauses to criticise the Fort of St. Paul: 'This fortress, being situated in the very middle 'of the town, cannot contribute to the defence of St. 'Petersburg.' The architecture and national customs of Russia are made the subject of bright comment. Here, in few words, is an admirable description of the Russian soldier of 1856: 'It is with him as with the whole nation, 'without his chiefs he would be in the most mortal difficulty. 'Who would think for him? Who would lead him? Who 'would punish him?' He is a pacific animal, who knows nothing of cock- or bull-fighting; 'but an order from his 'superior suffices to make of the most peaceable Russian— 'against his tastes, it is true, and against his wishes—a 'soldier the most trustworthy, the most faithful to his duty.' And here speaks the cool observer of a great military spectacle at Moscow: 'I do not attach importance to the 'deafening hurrahs which lasted several hours; but it was 'evident that these *vieilles moustaches* were pleased to see 'their Czar.'

* Preface to French translation of 'Letters from Russia.'

General Lewal's imagination has pictured a nature hopelessly soured by an unhappy boyhood, absorbed in sombre hatred of France, cherishing inordinate ambition carefully hidden, incapable of friendship or affection, dead to fancy, lost to all sense of gentleness and beauty—a calculating machine rather than a man of flesh and blood. 'L'humanité 'semble n'avoir jamais eu accès dans le cœur de ce grand 'silencieux.' In its place we are to find only 'cette haine 'qui a fait le fond de son caractère et l'a laissé isolé au 'milieu de la société.' We, with these many letters before us, derive an absolutely different impression. There are touches of tenderness and glimpses of quiet humour which lend the 'charm of genius' which Mr. O'Connor Morris finds wanting in the history of the Russo-Turkish war. Can a critical history of war really convey the sense of charm? 'On this bank,' writes the man of no imagination, 'Medea plucked enchanted herbs; down in that broad 'valley, at the end of which a stream glitters, camped the 'knights of the first Crusade.' Here is a description of the first sight of Constantinople:—

'On the tenth morning after our departure from Rustchuk we saw the sun rise behind a distant mountain, at the base of which lay a silver streak. This was Asia, the cradle of nations; there was snow-capped Olympus and clear Propontis with its deep blue surface studded with swan-like sails. Then arose, as it were from the sea, a forest of minarets, masts, and cyprus-trees. It was Constantinople.'

Later he describes the caïques, gracefully flitting over the calm waters of the Bosphorus, where 'the dolphin dances 'in the tide, follows the boats, flings himself into the air to 'breathe, and falls again with the speed of an arrow.' Here we find him pleading for two wretches about to suffer the bastinado: 'Out of particular respect for my person the 'Pasha consented to pardon them 200 blows a head, or, 'rather, a foot. The remaining number seemed to me 'more than sufficient; I proposed to him 25 blows, but he 'made me bargain up to 50.' Again, he describes the small difficulties of surveying in the streets of Constantinople, where 'the children try to make friends with me,' and 'the women—I speak of those of Turkey—show most 'curiosity.' To please them, he draws a portrait which they demand 'solely, perhaps, because it is forbidden.' It is a simple affair.—'A great white veil, pierced by two 'great black eyes, the end of a nose, and marked eyebrows 'which meet—nothing could be easier to reproduce. If I 'had a lithograph . . . I could have offered it to each, and

'all would have found it very like.' Even the pigeons of the great Mosque of Bajazet are not beneath his notice: 'Doubtless they are descended from the pigeon which whis-'pered into the ear of the Prophet, I know not what news; 'but most of these birds would be much embarrassed to 'establish their genealogy. One could not bring more 'exactitude to bear on its verification than on that of the 'numerous nephews of the Prophet.' The Turkish language has its difficulties, even for Von Moltke: 'One willingly 'assents to talk to a pasha through the medium of a 'dragoman; but to be reduced to that with young ladies is 'very hard.'

'Coulé en bronze, bronze il demeurera, conservant la 'ténacité et l'inflexibilité du métal, comme sa froideur et 'son insensibilité.' Such is the verdict of General Lewal. Inflexible on occasion he certainly was, as the unfortunate De Wimpffen found at the Château Donchéry; yet there was another and a different side to the character of the man. Thirty years did not suffice to make him forget the old tutor of his boyhood, to whom he forwarded a copy of the 'Letters on the East,' inscribed: 'To my dear master and friend, to 'whom I owe so much, I send this, my first work, as a 'slight token of my esteem.' 'Do not envy us this cam-'paign,' he writes from Asia Minor; 'it is full of horrors. 'More than 600 prisoners have perished; half were women 'and children. Women have been wounded, children have 'been bayonetted.' And personally he tended and fed many of the sufferers. Nearly thirty years later he thus feelingly writes of his defeated adversary: 'A vanquished 'commander! Oh! if outsiders had but the faintest notion 'what that may mean! The Austrian headquarters on the 'night of Königgrätz—I cannot bear to think of it. A 'general, too, so deserving, so brave, and so cautious.' Scattered throughout Von Moltke's writings there are many such intensely human touches. Reserved and inexpansive he doubtless was. His life was too completely given up to labour to allow leisure for the cultivation of many friend-ships; but that he was a mere cold, calculating machine is obviously untrue. His quiet, studious habits and intense dislike of all advertisement or semblance of flattery com-bined to throw a veil over his personality which has yet to be lifted. Meanwhile the statement of Baron von Bunsen, 'I believe that throughout his long life on earth he never 'made an enemy,' is, perhaps, the most striking tribute

which could be accorded to the memory of one who has played so great a part in history.

The short historical sketch of Poland, first published in 1832, and rescued from oblivion nearly half a century later, serves to throw additional light on the genius of Von Moltke. It is a simple, clear statement of facts with few comments; but here and there are passages which attest the writer's grasp of matters altogether outside of the pale of military science. The economic condition of the agricultural classes prior to the issue of the Prussian edict of September 14, 1811, is thus described :—

'The fields lay waste, the dwellings were in ruins. No peasant raised his hand to restore his hut, which threatened to fall in upon him, and in which he had no right of ownership. Though wood, straw, chalk and stones abounded, and nature had provided materials in the fields which surrounded the wretched villages, the peasant never dreamed of using them, for he did not know if next year he might not be forced to leave, without compensation, what he had built to-day. . . . Bread, it should be remembered, was a rarity for the peasant in the great granary of Europe; potatoes were his sole nourishment.'

The terms of the edict were of a sufficiently sweeping character, and their justification is thus stated :—

'According to the general principles of public law and political economy, the right of the State to ordinary and extraordinary taxes and dues is paramount, and the dues to the landlord are limited by the fact that he must leave the peasants means to exist and to satisfy the State. Their ability to do this can be taken for granted where the taxes due to the landlord do not exceed one-third of the income of an hereditary estate. The rights of the landlord could, therefore, never have been greater, or, if they were, it was illegal.'

The translation of such principles into law evoked strong remonstrance from the territorial magnates, descendants of the old nobility of Poland, who were prepared to prove that the reforms must be disastrous to the peasantry.

'The landlords naturally looked on the measures as severe and injurious, especially when they compared them with their former privileges. "They compensate us," they said, "with what is already our own property. . . . The sloth and idleness of the peasants will make labourers scarce and wages high. . . . The surveying of the estates and the special commission cause us great expense, and we are subjected to the exactions of subordinates who are always inclined to side with the peasant against us, and this is done in matters where our property depends on the insight, impartiality, and honesty of the commission. . . . This reform will, moreover, be of no avail to the common people, at least not to the poor peasant. . . . The right of

encumbering his property with debts and of selling it are sure to bring about his ruin."'

The revolution was, however, carried out, and the writer goes on to state:—

'Evidently the value of the land is increased by decreasing the extent of property and increasing the number of owners, especially in a country like Poland, where the produce of the fields can be so greatly increased, where endless woods, which bring in nothing, cover excellent wheat ground. . . .

'The State has obtained at last a numerous and valuable class of landowners, who, because they are bound to it by interest, are faithful and trustworthy subjects, a circumstance which should not be forgotten. A revolution may bring loss to the new owners, and, as they form the mass of the people, their increasing power furnishes the best guarantee to the Government.'

The passages above quoted were not written by an Irish Nationalist or an English Radical, but by an unknown lieutenant of the Prussian staff, little over thirty years old, then engaged on a survey of Silesia and the province of Posen. Sound or otherwise, the opinions thus expressed are remarkable under the circumstances as giving a new insight into the mind of the man who has taught the art of modern war to all Europe.

'Moltke seldom speaks in the Reichstag,' writes Professor Müller. 'A whole session may pass without his 'addressing the House, but when he does there is a death-'like silence amid the throng of eager listeners, anxious 'that not a word should escape them. Most of his speeches 'naturally bear upon military questions.' The premiership of England would be within the easy grasp of any soldier who had rendered her such services as Von Moltke conferred upon Prussia. It was the victor of Waterloo and hero of the Peninsula, not the Duke of Wellington, who was called upon to form a ministry in 1828. But the Nestor of the German army possessed a nature which could not find satisfaction in parliamentary life, and to the last he found other and more congenial work to do. His habits and experience did not tend to the formation of oratorical powers, but it is easy to understand the earnestness with which his rare utterances were followed, and the powerful aid he was able to give to the military measures of the Government. Speaking on the Bill introduced in February, 1874, for fixing permanently the strength of the peace standing army, he said:—

'The first necessity for a State, in order to exist, is to secure itself

externally. Minor states can do this by neutrality; a great Power must rely upon itself and on its strength, being armed and determined to defend its liberty and its right. To leave a country defenceless would be the greatest crime a Government could commit.'

In memorable words he went on to state where the strength of an army lies:—

'It has been said that it is the schoolmaster who has won our battles for us. Mere knowledge, however, does not raise a man to the point at which he is willing to stake his life for an idea—for duty, honour, or fatherland. It needs a whole training for this. It is not the schoolmaster, but the State which has won our battles—the State which, for sixty years past, has been physically and morally arming and training the nation to punctuality and order, to conscientious obedience, to love of country and manliness.'

In an admirable chapter of his great work* Captain Mahan, U.S.N., has described the conditions essential to the existence of 'Sea-Power.' In the words above quoted, Von Moltke lays down, as Scharnhorst had done, one of the conditions on which the power of a modern army depends. It is, in a sense, the fault of the State that the army of Turkey is not one of the most formidable in Europe, even though the causes may be traced further and deeper. Social and political conditions lie at the root of the weakness of the British army.

Interesting from another point of view are the few words spoken by Von Moltke in support of the laws proposed in 1876 for the suppression of Socialism. To him the struggle for existence appeared to be not merely inevitable, but the essential condition of progress. To the stress of that struggle the germs of Socialism owed their existence.

'Want and privation are a necessary condition of humanity which no form of government, no code of laws, no human measures can ever set aside. And how could the human race have attained to its present development without the aid of these coercive elements in the divine economy? No, there will always be care and labour in the future; but a man starving with cold and hunger does not think of the future, but grasps at such means of relief as the present holds out, and is driven by unbridled passion and mortified hopes to acts of violence which his leaders are least of all capable of hindering.'

Then, turning to the proceedings of the Commune in Paris, he drew the following lesson:—

'*There* was an opportunity of showing what democracy could do towards an attempted realisation of its ideals. Yet, though it destroyed much, it constructed nothing. . . . On the path of overthrow the evil

* The Influence of Sea-Power on History.

element soon absorbs the good, and a moderate Liberal always has a Radical at his back to goad him on. And this has been the chief error of so many in thinking it possible to level down to their own standard, and to call "Halt!" as if an express train could be pulled up at a moment's notice without destruction to all who are in it!'

In spite of the earnest attention which the speech obtained, the Bill was thrown out by a majority of nearly five to one, and a dissolution followed shortly afterwards.

Of the military genius of the man who for more than thirty years was the directing brain of the army which he organised and guided to victory in three campaigns, it is not easy to form a just estimate. On the one hand, the completeness of his successes and the unbounded confidence which he inspired tend to dazzle the judgement; on the other hand, the campaigns which he conducted were too few and too short to supply a sufficiency of comparison with those of Napoleon. More modern standards are at present wanting. The change of conditions which had arisen at the period when Von Moltke began to organise war was greater and more wide-reaching than any which preceded. The campaigns of Cæsar admit of comparison with those of Turenne. The handling of armies by Turenne may be contrasted with that by Napoleon. But at the period at which Von Moltke took office new forces had come into play. The musket did not possess much greater power than the yew bows of England. The field gun of Waterloo was not a much more formidable weapon than that of Blenheim. In the developement which followed the invention of rifling, however, a leap in advance was taken. Even more important in its influence upon the conduct of war was the immense improvement of the road communication of Europe and the introduction of railways. Most important of all was the moral revolution, brought about by education and the new requirements demanded of all ranks in the huge national armies which were no longer capable of being handled as a whole. In place of a cumbrous engine controlled by a single will, an army had become a vast living mass instinct with vivid life throughout its whole being, an instrument of extreme complexity, flexible to the last degree, a loose aggregate of men or a weapon of terrific power according to the perfection of its parts and the spirit and intelligence of its thousands of subordinate leaders. The nature of this change has been well expressed by Colonel Maurice in the introduction to his recent work*:—

* War, 1891.

'Under the conditions of the past, the general in command of an army relied upon its perfection in drill and in formal manœuvres for enabling him to direct it with success against the weak points of an adversary. Now he must depend, instead, upon the perfection of its organization, and of a training adapted to make each man ready when required to apply sound principles in any emergency.'

We, with the history of the campaigns of 1866 and 1870–1 before us, write and speak glibly of the principles of organisation which modern conditions entail upon armies; but, with the clear insight of true genius, Von Moltke, the student of war, untried in any great campaign, firmly grasped those principles, and applied them throughout the whole vast fabric of the German army. It is not possible to apportion its precise relative weight to each of the three determining factors—the directing brain of the great Chief of the Staff, the complete trust reposed upon him by William I., and the inherent characteristics of the German race—which have combined to make that army the model of Europe. To admit the remarkable coincidence of conditions favourable to military power, is in no sense to detract from the genius of Von Moltke.

The words of Baron von der Goltz, above quoted, embody a great truth. If in 'the spirit of the age' are to be sought the causes which lay at the root of the collapse of Prussia in 1806, then assuredly in the national characteristics at a later period lay the strength of the army of 1870. Although the German race has always shown aptitude for a military training,* it cannot claim any special genius for administration. No foreign nation has ever produced such an administrative machine as the government of India. None can show a private organisation to rival that of the North-Western Railway. But Germany has, sternly and without regard to class interests, applied the great principles of administration to her army; and we, copying the letter here and there with little intelligence, while neglecting the spirit, continue to manifest in military matters every phase of administrative incapacity. Von Moltke saw clearly the needs of modern war and, following in the steps of Scharnhorst and Clausewitz, with inimitable earnestness set about the great task of devising a system to meet those needs. King William had the strong good sense to rely on

* 'Germani suas copias castris eduxerunt generatimque constituerunt.' —Cæsar, De Bello Gallico. Tacitus also alludes to a species of territorial organisation, for military purposes, existing at an early date.

his Chief of the Staff; the nation learned to understand and trust him implicitly. We, with a potential armed strength of a million of men, are not at present able to realise that 'the 'responsible duty of preparing plans of military operations, 'collecting and co-ordinating information of all kinds, and 'generally tendering advice upon all matters of organisation 'and the preparation of the army for war,'* requires 'a 'special department' for its due discharge. A Von Moltke installed at Pall Mall would, under existing circumstances, find his hand paralysed. Genius, fettered by the trammels of a false system of administration, is almost useless to a State. Mediocrity under a sound system can at least turn out good work, and the great general staff which Von Moltke reared will continue to inspire the German army though the master has passed away.

It was virtually a new organisation which his genius created. Napoleon had no staff in the present sense. Preparation for war, as Von Moltke taught it to Germany, had no counterpart at the beginning of this century. Enthusiasm, and the genius, personal prestige, and readiness of resource of the commander, were the conditions under which victory was wooed and won. No previous campaign was prepared as was that of 1870. No military concentration had ever been worked out to its last detail as was that which placed 370,000 men in the Palatinate in fifteen days. Thus the two methods of war—that of Napoleon and Von Moltke—differed essentially. The Napoleonic method had its weak side, in that it rested too completely upon the individual genius of the commander, left too much to the decision of the moment, and was not well suited to the handling of great masses spread over wide distances. The rare powers of Napoleon served to veil this weak side, which, however, his lieutenants, less gifted, frequently disclosed. It is impossible to believe that even Napoleon would not have derived advantage from a partial adoption of the later method, and he has himself explained how he would have organised an army if he had had time. In any case, the new conditions of war demanded change. The mobilisation of an army in which the greater part of the troops had to be recalled from their homes, forwarded to their respective centres, equipped, and then transported in large fighting units to the place of concentration, would be painfully slow, if not impossible, unless every requirement had been foreseen

* Report of Lord Hartington's Commission.

and provided for in advance. The great transporting power supplied by railways could not be utilised unless the most careful study had been devoted to the ways and means.

The old order had changed and the old methods no longer sufficed. It is the lasting distinction of Von Moltke that he grasped the new requirements, and, with a patience and earnestness above all praise, devoted himself to their fulfilment. 'Berthier,' truly says General Lewal, 'd'une véri-'table modestie et d'une capacité militaire assez ordinaire, 'se contentait de la position de secrétaire assidu, vigilant, 'exact, d'un général incomparable, et ne prétendait pas être 'autre chose qu'un agent de transmission des ordres et des 'rapports.' What the Chief of the Staff is to the commander of a German army, and how great the services rendered by the general staff to the whole military system, readers of Captain Spenser Wilkinson's excellent little work * will be able to judge. Lieut.-General Brackenbury has summed up these services in evidence given in 1887 before the House of Commons Committee on army and navy estimates. The general staff is stated to be 'the keystone of the whole 'system of German military organisation . . . the cause of 'the great efficiency of the German army . . . the powerful 'brain of the military body, to the designs of which brain 'the whole body is made to work.' Even the 'incomparable 'general' of our day—if he exists—cannot afford to dispense with the assistance of this living force. In no other known way can a great army be organised for war or a great campaign adequately prepared. Every great power of Europe has endeavoured to reproduce, according to its ability, the system to the perfection of which Von Moltke devoted half a lifetime. Great Britain alone has at present no semblance of a great general staff, with the results disclosed in the official history of the Soudan expeditions.

As an organiser Von Moltke is admitted to have been unrivalled. He 'has "organised victory" more thoroughly 'than has ever been seen,' writes Mr. O'Connor Morris. To the mind of General Lewal the very refinement of his forethought and calculation seems almost a degradation of the military art, dragging it down to the level of the workshop.

'Depuis longtemps la conception de la guerre à venir lui est apparue comme une affaire industrielle soumise aux règles précises de calcul. . . . Après s'être usiné lui-même, il va usiner l'armée prussienne. . . .

* The Brain of an Army.

De Moltke est un spécialiste étrange, ayant conduit la guerre sans avoir jamais combattu; c'est un industriel militaire, un entrepreneur de combats, ayant poussé l'usinage guerrier à un degré inconnu jusqu'à lui. Cette prévoyance, ce calcul anticipé, ces dispositions réglées d'avance d'une manière presque irrévocable, constituent évidemment un ensemble remarquable et nouveau dans les annales de la guerre; c'est le triomphe de l'usinage et de l'outillage et, à ce titre, ils méritent d'être mis en évidence.'

The questions arise, however, whether Von Moltke's campaigns have not proved distinctly that this 'usinage' is an essential element of success in modern war, whether the disdainful term is really apt, and whether organisation for war in the new sense should not be placed in a much higher category. It is at least clear that the process of 'usinage' did not convert the German army into a rigid machine, but conferred upon it extreme flexibility in spite of the great masses of men requiring to be handled.

The 'complete project' which, as General Lewal states, was supplied by Von Moltke to King William in the spring of 1869 was a project of mobilisation and little else. None knew better than 'the great arithmetician' the limits of calculation and prevision. 'It is almost impossible,' he wrote, 'during a campaign to remedy an error in the primary concentration of the troops. . . . No plan of operations can with any certainty reach beyond the first encounter with the enemy.' The 'complete' plan of campaign, which has appealed so strongly to some imaginations, is defined in Von Moltke's masterly *précis* of the operations of 1870-1:—

'In the plan of campaign, submitted by the Chief of the Staff, and accepted by the King, that officer had his eye fixed from the first upon the capture of the enemy's capital, the possession of which is of more importance in France than in other countries. On the way thither the hostile forces were to be driven as persistently as possible back from the fertile southern provinces into the narrower tract on the north. But, above all, the plan was based on the resolve to attack the enemy at once, wherever found, and keep the German troops so compact that a superior force could be brought into the field.'

But in making arrangements to supply and reinforce the army under all contingencies, and to use to the utmost the transporting power of available railways, the plan was worked out to the last detail.

'The orders for marching, and travelling by rail or boat, were worked out for each division of the army, together with the most minute directions as to their different starting points, the duration of the journey, the refreshment stations, and places of destination . . . and

thus, when war was declared, it needed only the royal signature to set the entire machine in motion with undisturbed precision. There was nothing to be changed in the directions previously given.'

The distinction is important, as showing the limitations of this 'calcul anticipé'—the point at which 'usinage' must end. In war the period is quickly reached when 'our 'will clashes with the independent will of our opponent, 'upon which limits can be put by a well-timed and deter-'mined initiative, but which can only be overcome by actual 'combat.' *

As a director of war, Von Moltke has been variously estimated. To some of his countrymen he appears the Andrea del Sarto of strategists. In the judgement of General Lewal he is an 'ingénieur de combats plus que général de 'l'armée,' and he will pass down to posterity 'dépourvu du 'prestige et du nimbe glorieux qui font resplendir le front 'des grands soldats.' According to Mr. O'Connor Morris, his operations 'do not reveal one grand strategic conception, 'and are characterised by several grave errors. . . . He 'has not even approached the height of Napoleon. We miss 'originality in his conceptions of war,' &c.

The latter verdict is wholly unjust, and the reason is, perhaps, not difficult to seek. The great Chief of the Staff had none of the dazzling personality of Napoleon. For him there was no bridge of Arcola. No grandiloquent manifestoes, no invocations of glory, no appeals to avarice,† no allusions to 'the 'sun of Austerlitz,' or the forty centuries looking down from the worn summits of the Pyramids, ever issued from him to infect an army with the fever of battle. The theatrical element was utterly foreign to a nature which knew not ''Ercles' vein.' Retiring to a fault, Von Moltke perfectly understood his functions, and never sought to pass

* Von Moltke. In the recently published *précis*, this is still further emphasised. 'It is a delusion to believe that a plan of war may be laid down for a long period and carried out in detail. The first collision with the enemy's army changes the situation entirely, according to the result. Some things decided upon will become impracticable; others, which originally seemed impossible, become possible. All that the leader of an army can do in a change of circumstances is to decide for the best for an unknown period, and carry out his purpose unflinchingly.'

† 'Je veux vous conduire dans les plus fertiles plaines du monde. De riches provinces, de grandes villes seront en votre pouvoir; vous y trouverez honneur, gloire et richesses.'—Proclamation in 1796 to the Army of Italy.

outside them. In the single person of Napoleon centred the glory alike of the strategic stroke and the well-ordered battle. It was Von Moltke's *rôle* to move armies to battles which others would fight. He was 'a soldier fit to stand by 'Cæsar and give directions,' but no aspirant to Cæsar's purple. Napoleon's military career ended at the age of forty-six; Von Moltke's first European campaign was fought when he was sixty-four. For twenty-one years Napoleon was almost continuously at war; Von Moltke's two great campaigns occupied less than eleven months. There was no time for the one to attain the personal prestige of the other, even if, yielding to the tendency of the age, he had made self-advertisement the first object of his life. Each created an empire—the one in the hopeless attempt to satisfy his personal ambition, the other in single-hearted devotion to his King and his country. The military genius of the two men cannot be compared without first stripping Napoleon of half the glamour—the 'nimbe glorieux'—which has gathered around his great name. For the real question is, whether there is any reason to suppose that to the brilliant campaigns of 1866 and 1870 Napoleon could have added brilliancy. No such reason can be alleged; and it is possible to believe that, just as Von Moltke did not possess the magnetic qualities required to create and lead to conquest the impressionable armies of the First Republic, so was Napoleon wanting in the power of patient labour, by means of which the hosts of Germany were quietly organised and then directed to victory.

Mr. O'Connor Morris brings the usual charges against the strategy of the 1866 campaign. 'All the apologies that 'have been made on this subject will not mislead the 'student of war.' To us the matter presents itself in a different light. Risks have to be run in war to attain great ends; and the risks of Prussia in 1866 were not all military, as Bismarck well knew. Von Moltke, in the plan of invasion which led direct to the victory of Königgrätz and the swift overthrow of Austria, staked upon his knowledge of the distribution of the Austrian troops, their readiness for war, their powers of movement, and the character of their commanders. He won; and, as he has himself said, 'Everything 'in military history is judged by results.' Given the telegraph, this 'faulty' plan appears to be exactly what Napoleon, who was accustomed to stake upon his adversaries' slowness, and who, as Wurmser complained, was in the habit of ignoring the so-called rules of war, might have

adopted. It is impossible not to suspect that Mr. O'Connor Morris would have held his hero justified, even worthy of high praise, in a similar case. General Lewal rightly dismisses the criticism which has been expended upon the advance into Bohemia:—

'Double faute stratégique, ont dit les doctrinaires. Ils se sont trompés. La combinaison se trouvait bonne parce qu'elle était contraire à toute prévision, et ne présentait rien d'imprudent puisque le peu de mobilité des Autrichiens donnait l'assurance aux Prussiens d'être concentrés avant eux.'

It is useless to speculate as to what might have happened if Napoleon or Turenne had been 'in the place of the 'Austrian chief.' Benedek was neither a Napoleon nor a Turenne, and Von Moltke was not only well aware of the fact, but had gained exceptional insight into the weak points of the Austrian army during the Danish war. Criticism of this class is of little value, and is permissible only when applied to both of two commanders whom it is intended to compare. No great general was more in the habit of taking liberties with opponents, whose capacity he had gauged, than Napoleon.

The campaign of 1866 throws a strong light on the genius of Von Moltke as a director of war, and on the working of the system which he had built up. From the first its power was manifest. As Captain Spenser Wilkinson points out, five short orders from the King's headquarters sufficed to win a great campaign, and in the decision quickly arrived at in the Lion Inn at Gitschin on July 2 Von Moltke showed all the qualities of a great commander. It was instantly realised that in him lay something far beyond

> '. . . the bookish theorick
> Wherein the toged Consul can propose
> As masterly as he . . .'

The reticent, studious Chief of the Staff proved himself a great soldier in the field.

July 3 was to have been a day of rest for the Prussian armies, to enable careful reconnaissances to be made. It was believed that the mass of the Austrians lay on the left bank of the Elbe, the flanks resting on the fortresses of Josephstadt and Königgrätz. On the afternoon of July 2, however, Prince Frederick Charles discovered the enemy in force along the line of the Bistritz some seven miles to the west of the Elbe, and determined to attack at daybreak, sending all the available information to the King's head-

quarters at Gitschin. With unerring instinct Von Moltke grasped the situation. The army of the Crown Prince, much exhausted with severe fighting and heavy marches, was near Königinhof, about twenty miles distant. It was just possible to bring this army up in time, and, if this were done, the result was assured.

'With a "Thank God!" I sprang out of bed,' writes Von Moltke, 'and hastened to the King. . . . After I had given him a short account of the situation, he declared his entire concurrence in my proposal to draw all three armies together for a battle on the following day. . . . The whole conversation with his Majesty hardly lasted more than ten minutes, and there was no one else present.'

When the actors of 1866 have all passed away, when time has lent the necessary perspective and swept away the many conditions which now cloud military judgement, Von Moltke's campaign will be regarded as rivalling in brilliancy even that of 1796.

We, with full knowledge at our disposal, are apt to accept the great concentration in the Palatinate in July 1870 as a natural and obvious measure—to say, with Mr. O'Connor Morris, that 'the situation dictated the plan.' In estimating the military genius of a director of war, however, it is necessary to realise his position, to feel the weight of his responsibilities, and to appreciate the risk as it presented itself to him. A vigorous offensive was the keynote of Von Moltke's strategy, as of that of Napoleon. His great object was to place superior masses of troops in front of the French armies with the least delay. There were obvious risks in the opening move—risks which it is certain were fully realised at the Prussian headquarters. If the French preparations had proved a little more advanced than was expected, if the plan which Napoleon III. adopted had been even partially feasible, the dangers involved in this concentration almost within striking distance of the enemy are evident. Yet Von Moltke never hesitated for a moment. He had formed a true estimate of the situation, and, in spite of his seventy years, his self-reliance enabled him to conquer all opposition and adhere inexorably to his plan. The decision exercised a determining influence upon the course of the campaign. Original or not, it was distinctly a strategic conception of the first class. Napoleon, at his best, could have devised no better opening move. And it was due to the years of patient labour of the Prussian Chief of the Staff that the military feat, which, if it contained

'nothing original,' sufficed, nevertheless, to astonish Europe, was accomplished. The early battles on the frontier—Weissenberg, Wörth, Spicheren—were the first-fruits of the rapid massing of men in the Palatinate. It is usual to speak of them as undesigned and unpremeditated. Such, in a sense, must generally be the conflicts arising from a first contact with an enemy; and, as Colonel Maurice points out,* this improvisation of battles is 'an almost inevitable consequence 'of the present condition of armies.' 'Tactical victory,' writes Von Moltke in his *précis*, 'rarely fails to coincide 'with a strategic policy. Success in battle has always been 'thankfully accepted and turned to account.' In this case the 'strategic policy' was directly furthered, for MacMahon's force of more than 40,000 men was not merely defeated at Wörth, but broken up into a mass of fugitives who could not be rallied till they reached Châlons, and never recovered their lost *moral*. Moreover, these frontier battles had the result of partially isolating the army of Bazaine; while Steinmetz and Prince Frederick Charles pressed forward across the Vosges, and the troops of the Crown Prince poured through the Gap of Saverne.

Von Moltke's handling of the three armies during this period was characterised by an admirable combination of vigour and caution. The problem was to hold the French at Metz, to interpose a large force between them and Verdun as rapidly as possible, and at the same time to enable the armies to afford each other effective material support. On the morning of the 14th, it became clear that the retreat from Metz had begun, and the battle of Colombey-Nouilly, begun in the afternoon of that day by the advance-guard of the 7th Corps, effectually delayed the movement of a considerable French force. 'The advantages of victory,' wrote Von Moltke in the orders issued on the 15th, 'can only be 'reaped by a vigorous offensive movement against the roads 'leading from Metz to Verdun.' This movement immediately took place, and the orders for the 16th gave directions to the generals of the Second Army 'to assume a 'vigorous defensive with all the reserves at command.' The great battle of Mars-la-Tour resulted, in which the leading troops of Prince Frederick Charles found themselves opposed to the greater part of Bazaine's army. German reinforcements were hurried to the front, and the fighting lasted till nightfall. Tactically, Mars-la-Tour was a drawn

* War.

fight; strategically, Von Moltke's success was complete. Bazaine's retreat was arrested, and the two following days sealed the fate of his army. Had he attacked on August 17, when part of the Second Army was still on the right bank of the Moselle, he might apparently have secured his retreat to Verdun. Had he, on the 18th, struck out from Metz to the south-east, he might have cut the communications of the Germans. It is easy to say this; but the possibility turns entirely upon the state of organisation of the French troops and their transport, after the severe fighting and heavy losses of the 16th. 'He would certainly have saved 'himself and his army,' writes Mr. O'Connor Morris. In our judgement he would have saved neither; but unquestionably the movement would for a time have compromised the German arrangements and retarded the wave of invasion. Von Moltke, writing seventeen years afterwards, appears to think that Bazaine might have shaken himself clear on the 16th, if he had fought the battle of Mars-la-Tour with this object in view.

'If the Marshal had been resolved to proceed [to Verdun] he would have to engage and get rid of the enemy in front of him. It is hard to decide from a purely military standpoint why this alternative was not taken. There was hardly a doubt that only a part, and probably only a small part, of the German armies had crossed the Moselle, and the French were decidedly the stronger when in the course of the day the divisions that had remained in Metz arrived. But it seems that the Marshal's first object was not to be forced away from Metz; almost his entire concern was for the left wing. . . . We are tempted to fancy that political reasons alone induced Bazaine thus early in the game to attach himself to Metz.'

The 17th of August saw the French taking up a strong position outside of Metz, while the Second and part of the First German Armies rapidly closed towards them. No respite was granted by Von Moltke, and on the 18th the French were attacked. The correctness of this decision is unquestioned; but the tactical conduct of the tremendous battle of Gravelotte-St. Privat has evoked the criticism which will probably always be forthcoming in the case of conflicts occurring under such circumstances, and involving such great masses of men. Von Moltke himself considered that it would have been wiser to have deferred the onslaught of the Second Army Corps till the 19th. 'A body of troops 'still completely intact might have been of great value the 'next day; a decisive effect could hardly be produced this 'evening.' He frankly accepted the responsibility which

lay with the Chief of the Staff, being present, for not stopping such a movement. Beyond this his responsibility for the conduct of the fighting of August 18 did not extend.

Bazaine was now chained to Metz, which must be invested, and 'this necessitated a complete redistribution' of the German army, drawn up under many difficulties by Von Moltke on the night of Gravelotte, and issued next morning. The strategy of the campaign was, however, about to take a further turn wholly beyond the limits of all prevision. The French troops defeated in Alsace were being reformed at Châlons, whither reinforcements had been gathered. During the heavy fighting round Metz, touch had been lost. Would MacMahon, when the result of the fighting of August 18 was known, stand at Châlons, take post to the north-east of Paris to threaten the flank of the German advance, or fall back and seek to cover the capital directly? On the night of Gravelotte, Von Moltke thus expressed his view of the situation:—

'The success of the last few days renders it both possible and expedient that the troops should have sufficient rest to recoup themselves after their recent losses. It is further necessary that the armies should advance with such speed on Paris as to be in sufficient strength to oppose the French troops now in course of reformation at Châlons.'

On the 21st, orders were issued to the army of the Crown Prince, which was to lead the advance, supported by a portion of the Second Army. Later information was to the effect that Napoleon III., with a large force, was at Rheims. An intercepted letter from Metz expressed the hope that the Châlons army would come to the relief of Bazaine; a telegram from London stated: 'MacMahon's army concen-'trated at Rheims . . . MacMahon is trying to effect a 'junction with Bazaine.' It was characteristic of Von Moltke that he could not at first believe that his opponents were about to commit an error so fatal. 'In war,' he has written, 'probabilities alone have to be reckoned with; and the 'probability, as a rule, is that the enemy will adopt the 'most correct measures.' Podbielski, to whose mind the political exigencies of the tottering Empire sufficed to account for any military error, seems to have been the first to recognise that the improbable was about to occur. The caution and judgement displayed by Von Moltke at this period are altogether admirable. He would not at first give a complete change of direction to the advancing armies,

'on the ground of rumours that might, after all, prove unfounded. . . . Many difficulties must have resulted from such a course; the arrangements for bringing up provisions and reserves would have to be cancelled and purposeless marches would shake the confidence of the troops in their commanders.'

Thus the line of advance was merely deflected from Châlons to Rheims, and the cavalry 'were ordered to 'Buzancy and Vouziers, where a full insight into the situa-'tion might be obtained.' This was not all, however, for 'the Chief of the Staff, on the same day [the 26th], worked 'out a *Marschtableau*, by which the three corps of the army 'of the Meuse, together with the two nearest Bavarian 'corps, could be assembled in the vicinity of Damvilliers, on 'the right bank of the Meuse, in three not too heavy march-'ing days.' The reports were confirmed; the cavalry found the enemy in force, and the mass of the army of the Crown Prince was at once swung round to the north.* The Germans were advancing echeloned left in front, and the great movement thus permitted their long transport trains to follow without entanglement. 'Ce mouvement est incontestable-'ment très beau,' writes General Lewal; and the annals of strategy record nothing finer. The catastrophe of Sedan was greater than that of Ulm; Von Moltke's generalship reached the level of that of Napoleon. The last real hope remaining to France now lay in the possibility that Bazaine might be able to break through the iron circle with which Metz was quickly girt.

The causes of the inherent weakness in the field of the armed levies with which the Republic sought to replace the imprisoned armies have been exactly defined by Von Moltke:—

'Such forces, animated by a spirit of enthusiastic patriotism, would offer a protracted resistance if put in motion by a strong will;' but the civilian War Minister 'did not dare to let the command from out of his hands. In such a republic, a victorious general at the head of an army would soon become dictator in his stead. . . . With rare strength of will and immovable fixity of purpose, Gambetta was able to arm the whole population of the country, but not to direct the masses thus formed according to one harmonious plan. Without giving them time to acquire the cohesion of troops fit for the field, and before they were completely equipped, he flung them, without regard for consequences and without any general plan, against an enemy before whose superior leadership all their gallantry and devotion were in vain. He prolonged

* The London telegram made no difference of any kind, as Colonel Maurice appears to suppose.

the struggle at the cost of great sacrifices on both sides, without in any way turning the tide of fortune in favour of France.'

But, it must be added, these raw levies at least redeemed the honour of a great nation, and proved to the world that its natural capacity for war had not been destroyed by an artificial form of government and a false military system.

Although strategy, in its higher aspects, was not called into play during the later stages of the war, the genius of Von Moltke, his patience, caution, and readiness of resource, were amply illustrated. The single cool brain, for the want of which Gambetta's hapless levies were expended in disjointed efforts, continued to guide the German armies. The fall of Soissons gave one through railway route to Paris; that of Mézières, on January 1, opened another. The surrender of Bazaine, at the end of October, freed troops which were instantly sent, by forced marches, to the support of Von der Tann, compelled to abandon Orléans in face of the great superiority of numbers wielded by D'Aurelle. The co-operation with Faidherbe and Bourbaki, which Chanzy, 'the nearest and most dangerous' of the opponents of Prince Frederick Charles, hoped for, was frustrated by the advance of the Second Army Corps on Le Mans. Faidherbe failed to relieve Peronne, and was defeated by Von Goeben at St. Quentin. The approach of Manteuffel, despatched to the support of Von Werder before Belfort, determined the retreat of Bourbaki, who was soon afterwards driven across the Swiss frontier. 'Thus,' states Von Moltke, 'two French 'armies were prisoners in Germany, a third was locked up 'in the capital, and a fourth was disarmed and on foreign 'territory.' With the fall of Paris, at the end of January, all further resistance was hopeless.

Any careful study of the way in which Von Moltke, during a long and anxious period, maintained a firm grip upon the French capital and manœuvred subordinate armies over a great part of France, serves to reveal his sterling qualities as a director of war. Throughout this period he retained a complete hold of the entire situation. He knew exactly when to strike, how much to demand of the troops, and how far his enemies were to be respected. Never once thrown off his guard, never tempted to underrate his opponents, he showed the perfect balance of judgement which is unquestionably genius. It is not pretended that this was strategy in its higher aspects; but there were sufficient chances of error, and a mind less great, a nature less patiently careful,

would have been carried away by the tremendous successes obtained against the regular armies of France. It is the completeness of the genius of the man which fifty years hence will impress the military student.

In the diary of the late Emperor Frederick there are stray notes which convey a vivid impression of the strength and decision of Von Moltke's character. On August 20, after the great battles round Metz, we read of 'Moltke quite cool 'and clear as ever; determined to march on Paris; Bis-'marck moderate and by no means sanguine.' November 23, by which date the activity of the French army of the Loire was assuming great developement, is referred to as 'a 'moment of exciting combinations. Moltke explains the 'entire situation with the utmost clearness and modera-'tion; has always considered and calculated everything, and 'constantly hits the right nail on the head; but Roon's 'shoulder-shrugs and spitting, and Podbielski's Olympian 'assurance often influence the King.' On January 15, Von Werder having expressed a wish to be allowed to raise the siege of Belfort, 'Moltke read this out, and added with icy and imperturbable calm, "Your Majesty will doubtless permit '"me to inform General von Werder that he has simply to '"remain where he is and beat the enemy where he finds '"him?" . . . . Moltke appears to me to be beyond all 'praise. Within a second he had settled the whole affair.' Such glimpses show the great Chief of the Staff in an unmistakable light.

In the important appendix to his *précis* of the campaign Von Moltke disposes of several fictions. There was no approach to panic at Versailles, as has been stated. 'Ver-'sailles was protected by four army corps; to evacuate the 'place never entered into anyone's head.' As for councils of war at the German headquarters, 'I can certify that, 'neither in 1866 nor 1870–1 was a council of war ever held.' The working of the heart of the German system of administration in the field is simply described.

'Except on marching and fighting days, a report was regularly made to his Majesty at 10 A.M., when I, accompanied by the quartermaster-general, had to take over the reports and news received, and to make new proposals based upon them. The chief of the military cabinet and the war minister were present, and at Versailles, while the headquarters of the Third Army were there, the Crown Prince also; but only as listeners. The King occasionally demanded from them information as to one matter or another; but I do not remember that he ever asked their advice upon the operations, or my proposals relating to them. The

latter, which I had always discussed previously with my officers, were subjected by his Majesty to a most thorough personal investigation. He pointed out with military insight and always correct appreciation all the obstacles of the situation which might impede the execution of the measures; but, since in war every step involves danger, the proposals in the end were invariably adopted.'

It is a picture of ideal simplicity of higher administration, practicable only in the case of an army perfectly organised for war and possessing a Chief of the Staff whose genius demanded and obtained fullest confidence.

Von Moltke as a strategist will always suffer in comparison with Napoleon, by reason of the far fewer opportunities for the display of power which his career afforded. It may be said that a single proof of genius should suffice to fix the true place of a name in the roll of fame. Mankind as a whole will, however, always be imposed upon by magnitude, and achievements will inevitably impress in proportion to their number. Gray made less mark than poets who never approached the level of his elegy. Military history shows no more striking achievements than Von Moltke's two campaigns. By these campaigns we must judge him, and while it will be recognised that his genius was not proved by adversity, that he was never called upon to act under circumstances such as beset Napoleon in 1813, the military critic of the future, equipped with that sense of proportion which time alone can impart, will claim for the 'grand 'silencieux' a place by the side of the greatest captains of war. For, it will be asked, could Napoleon, or Turenne, who, said Napoleon, 'was the only one of us all who constantly improved in the management of his campaigns as he advanced in years,' have done better? Would either have done quite so well?

The German army and nation owe to Von Moltke much more than the successful conduct of campaigns. He built up a great system of administration suited to the needs of modern war. He raised organisation to a level previously unapproached, and reduced its principles to a science. To the student of military art in its broadest aspects he has taught more than Napoleon, for he has demonstrated the importance of that minute study of detail which Napoleon had no time to undertake. The armies which Von Moltke directed were by his own care and labour prepared for war in a sense which Napoleon had not grasped; and, it may fairly be added, the conditions under which the former was called upon to take the field involved a plunge into the unknown.

An army is a delicate organism. The spirit which animates it is capable of assuming many forms, and that spirit may be inspired by the life and example of few individuals. Personal ambition, flattery, greed of power and of wealth, were the main motives supplied by Napoleon, whose 'marshals 'and generals, it is to be feared, set a bad example to their 'subordinates. They grew rich at the expense of the inha-'bitants of the lands they occupied, and were often paid 'heavy sums for issuing orders against plundering . . . or 'for exempting towns from requisitions or occupation.' Berthier with emoluments amounting to about 55,000*l.* a year, Davoust with 37,000*l.*, serve to illustrate the seamy side of a system which is justly described as 'resting on no 'secure moral basis.'* In strongest contrast is the simple, earnest life of the great German Field-Marshal, in which personal aims, self-assertion, and vanity found no place. 'I have a hatred of all fulsome praise,' he wrote after returning from victory in Bohemia. 'It completely upsets 'me for the whole day. . . In this campaign I only did my 'duty; my comrades did theirs too.' 'Duty, honour, and 'the Fatherland' were the watchwords of his long and laborious life. It is impossible to overestimate the effect of such an example upon an army, which is quick to catch the tone of its leaders.

Von Moltke has left the memory of an unsullied life, in which nothing small or mean found a resting-place, and to which petty jealousy was unknown. Contented to labour for long years without recompense or recognition, the most dazzling successes took away none of the simplicity of his character and aims. Duty, fulfilled with rare conscientiousness, sufficed for his ambitions. He has left a great example to soldiers for all time, and this perhaps is the noblest of his claims to lasting distinction.

* 'Interior Economy of Napoleon's Armies,' by Captain E. S. May, R.A., 'United States Magazine,' November 1890.

ART. X.—*Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, 1886–1891.

THE twelfth Parliament of Queen Victoria was elected in the month of July 1886. It came into existence unexpectedly, owing to the sudden demise of its predecessor; and so strange and unexampled were the political conditions which surrounded its birth that few would have been bold enough, either at that date, or, indeed, for some time afterwards, to prophesy for the infant Parliament a long life or a successful career.

Lord Salisbury, as a result of the General Election, became for a second time Prime Minister—the head of a Ministry composed exclusively of Conservatives; yet he was unable to count upon the support in the House of Commons of more than 320 members of his party out of the 670 members of which that House was composed. Mr. Gladstone's followers were embittered by the defeat they had sustained at the polls. They were without the consolation which remained to Francis I. after the loss of the battle of Pavia, for their leaders had sacrificed everything without exception—political principle, consistency, the good name of their party—in order to win. And they had lost. Perhaps, under these circumstances, it was not unnatural that a minority, labouring under the sense of discredit no less than of defeat, should have turned still further aside from the honoured precedents of British politics and have closely allied itself with men who were not merely Home Rulers, but who had banded together to render the law itself powerless, and to prove the incapacity of Parliament to give effect by legislation to the wishes of the representatives of the United Kingdom. Mr. Gladstone had, doubtless, the power to restrain, with a word of honest remonstrance spoken in plain language, the excesses of many of his followers. These gentlemen were denouncing the conduct of every judge, magistrate, and policeman who upheld the law in Ireland; they were justifying or palliating the Plan of Campaign; they were aiding and abetting the policy of Parliamentary obstruction. Mr. Gladstone did not speak that word. Indeed, if the responsibility of leadership involves the duty of restraining as well as of guiding the zeal of those who are called his followers, Mr. Gladstone must be considered to have long thrown down the reins.

But the late Prime Minister, whether he restrained his party or whether, in the sense of determining its policy, he

even really led it, remained a great power with large masses of his countrymen. They believed in his sincerity. They did not understand his policy—which, indeed, warned by the fate of his Home Rule Bill, that cautious statesman took great pains not to reveal to them. The very existence of the Home Rule party might be endangered if a premature explanation were given of what Home Rule meant! Home Rule meant justice to Ireland. That was enough for the public to know; and, therefore, all who were in favour of justice as against injustice and tyranny were invited to rally round the standard of Mr. Gladstone. This use of a phrase, to which no definite meaning was attached, did well enough for many constituencies where there was little political enlightenment or independence of judgement. The intelligence of the country was revolted; but what is that to the party whip or party organisers if votes are on his side? The Opposition leaders were confident that Lord Salisbury's Ministry could not stand, and there were many calmer and less interested men who unwillingly took the same view of the situation. The key of the position was held by the Liberal Unionists. If these seventy members of the House of Commons and the Conservative 320 were able to work harmoniously together for the same ends, the Ministry and Parliament might yet accomplish great things for the nation. But the possibility of this was just what men doubted. It was upon their disbelief in the continuance of this harmony that Mr. Gladstone and his friends had built their hopes. They knew the strength of party feeling. They knew that Lord Hartington and Mr. Bright, Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Henry James, had all their lives been strong party men, who had fought to the uttermost under the leadership of Mr. Gladstone against the party which sat opposite them. To break politically with Mr. Gladstone must have been to these statesmen, to Lord Selborne and to many others—

'Souls that had toiled and wrought and thought with him'—

a most painful duty. Amongst their followers there was, moreover, hardly one who had not in the past fought and won battles for the Liberal party, and who personally had not everything to hope from its speedy reunion upon sound Liberal principles. Liberal Unionists would not, indeed, under any circumstances, or for any object however dear to them, allow the splitting up into fragments of the legislative authority of the supreme Parliament or of the authority of

the executive Government of its choice. A single supreme Parliament and executive are essential to the unity of the nation. There were, however, amongst Mr. Gladstone's colleagues, men whose language implied at all events some inward leanings towards the principles of Unionism, which before 1886 they had held, and whose language, however irreconcilable with their support of the Home Rule Bill of 1886, afforded the hope that they would never again make themselves responsible for a measure which would be a halfway house to complete separation. If this were so, there would come about a drawing together of Liberal Unionists and the less extreme of the Home Rule followers of Mr. Gladstone. So it seemed to many at the time when the Parliament of 1886 assembled at Westminster.

It must be admitted that it was a novel experiment which was about to be tried. Previous history gave little encouragement to men's hopes of the solidarity and continuance of the Unionist Alliance. Its duration and its success depended mainly upon three conditions: The steadfastness of Liberal Unionists, the behaviour of the Gladstonian party, and the conduct of the Conservative Ministry. It is clear that the alliance of Liberals and Conservatives would be greatly weakened if Liberal Unionists wavered as to their main principle or if Gladstonians so conducted their opposition as to gain general respect and confidence; or, again, if the Conservatives showed themselves to be Tories of the old school, fearing to advance with the times, and jealous to prevent the inevitable advance of democracy.

It is in consequence of the answer that events have given on these all-important questions that the Unionist Alliance has proved so eminently successful; and that the Ministry and Parliament, which commenced their career in the midst of such great difficulties, stand out in the very front rank as amongst the most successful of the Queen's reign.

The last five years have been years of trial. How have our political parties, how have our leading statesmen, stood the test? We have already referred to the irresponsible and regrettable conduct to which a beaten Opposition, in the bitterness of its spirit, had recourse. It seemed for a time to be their purpose to demonstrate that Gladstonianism and Parnellism, in the ends proposed and the means to be employed, were identical. Mr. Parnell became for more than four years the hero of the Gladstonian party, second only to Mr. Gladstone himself. The Eighty Club gave him a dinner. Mr. Gladstone entertained him at Hawarden. Edinburgh

voted him the freedom of the city. Yet Mr. Parnell was the same individual and was promoting identically the same policy as when Mr. Gladstone had put him in prison, and when Sir William Harcourt was denouncing the doctrines of the Land League as doctrines of assassination and of treason. After January 1886 and before November 1890 no true Gladstonian would tolerate a doubt thrown upon the absolute trustworthiness of the member for Cork! If he and Lord Carnarvon were at issue upon a plain question of fact, it was not the former who had taken liberties with the truth! Only the most bigoted Unionist would hesitate to entrust the destinies of Ireland to so enlightened, so moderate, and so high-minded a statesman! The Act of Union of 1801 was but paper, and who could base a United Kingdom on so fragile a foundation? With Mr. Gladstone in power in Downing Street, and Mr. Parnell in power in Dublin, the union between Great Britain and Ireland was to become and to remain a 'union of hearts'—a union founded on a rock which no future storms could shake and no lapse of time decay! We are not caricaturing, we are recording the sort of stuff which did duty on Gladstonian platforms during the years that elapsed between Mr. Gladstone's acceptance of Mr. Parnell's Irish policy and the breach of November last between the two Home Rule leaders. Their baleful alliance is now at an end. May the humiliating retrospect serve as a warning to party leaders against co-operating with political agitators whose real objects patriotic and responsible statesmen must condemn, and whose methods of promoting them are repugnant to good citizens and to honest men!

The private life of Mr. Parnell is not our affair. It is the recollection of his public action, of his political methods—known to all men whom party zeal has not blinded, known and denounced by Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues themselves—that creates a kind of wondering disgust at recent Gladstonian adulation of the powerful master of many votes. The tale told in the Divorce Court was a bad one. For years before the disclosures of last November the substance of that story had been no secret in the lobbies of the House of Commons. So long as it appeared that Mr. Parnell's alliance was of importance, no honour was too great, no laudation too excessive, to be bestowed by a great English party upon its powerful ally. The Irish people—supposing, that is, that the Irish Home Rule members are entitled to speak on its behalf—unanimously declared that the disclosures of the Divorce Court were no hindrance to its

steadfast allegiance to the true leader of the Irish race. With Mr. Healy 'Mr. Parnell was less a man than an 'institution.' Messrs. Dillon and O'Brien telegraphed from America their steadfast determination to stand by Mr. Parnell, 'whose statesmanship and matchless qualities as 'leader are essential to the safety of the cause.' At last, however, the line had been overstepped, and the consciences of Mr. Gladstone's English followers, after a prolonged slumber, were beginning to awake. Liberal electors in every part of the country were loudly asserting themselves upon a matter the right or wrong of which it was beyond the power of sophistry to confuse. The position of English Home Rulers was, in its party aspect, an extremely difficult one. Mr. Gladstone took his line, and his late Attorney-General, Sir Charles Russell, described it at the time with accuracy and with a frankness which did him credit. 'It was not,' he said, in a speech on December 6, 1890, 'until Mr. Gladstone saw the rising overwhelming tide of 'public opinion that he felt bound, in the interests of the 'party he led, to convey to the leader of the Irish people 'that his continued leadership would have a chilling effect 'upon the enthusiasm of many staunch friends.' In short, the Gladstone-Parnell alliance was at an end. Why? For the simple reason that English public opinion and Irish public opinion were at issue. And at issue about what? As to the leadership of the Irish Parliamentary party. Or, if Irish members prefer the grander phrase, the leadership of the Irish race. But surely this was especially 'an Irish 'affair.' The Irishman whom the Irish people thought the fittest to be the Irish chief the English people did not think good enough to be their own ally! And it was the English Home Rule leader who thus became the instrument of driving into the minds of men one leading doctrine of the Unionist party—the impossibility of confining to its own island the great public opinion of either England or Ireland. The age has long gone by for Englishmen and Irishmen to limit their interests and influence by the Irish Channel. It is the public opinion of the *whole* United Kingdom which, as to all matters of general interest, must prevail over the whole kingdom and every part of it. That opinion it is the business of our Parliamentary institutions to make known; the Government of that opinion is the Government to which alike England, Scotland, Ireland, and even the proud heart of gallant little Wales must perforce bow.

Unionists watched with the deepest interest the struggle

between Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell. For the party purposes of the moment it is possible that the success of the latter might have been rather beneficial than otherwise to Unionists. But the ultimate triumph of Unionism was, in fact, deeply involved on the side of Mr. Gladstone. With the defeat of Mr. Parnell would inevitably go—for the time, at all events—we trust for ever—the independence of the Irish Parliamentary party. The claim to act on behalf of a separate nationality, to be independent of English and Scottish parties, to turn the balance from the one side to the other, with exclusive regard to their own ends or to the orders of their chief, and with absolute indifference to the general welfare of the Empire, was a claim which Mr. Parnell had done much to make good. In 1884, when Mr. Gladstone wished to prolong 'coercion,' and the Conservatives were ready to abandon it, Mr. Parnell replaced Mr. Gladstone by Lord Salisbury. In 1886, when Mr. Gladstone accepted his Home Rule policy, Mr. Parnell restored him to power. In the first case the spirit duties, in the latter case 'three acres and a cow,' were made the occasions or pretexts for the change of government. Both in 1884 and 1886 the Irish policy of the Ministry or of the Opposition was, if not the immediate cause, at least the operative cause of the transformation that occurred. It was the independent action of the Liberal Unionists in 1886 that put an end to Mr. Parnell's domination of the situation, and took from him, during the present Parliament, the power of playing off the one party against the other. Mr. Gladstone's victory over Mr. Parnell appears, at the present time, to be complete. Mr. Parnell's successor, whoever he may be, will necessarily stand in a very different position from that occupied by Mr. Parnell during recent years. He will not be independent, for he will owe as much to Mr. Gladstone as Mr. Gladstone to him. His position has been created by the action of the English leader. If the latter, in deference to English opinion, could turn out Mr. Parnell, what security of tenure can there be for any possible successor?

The remarkable ascendency of Mr. Gladstone over the minds of men was never exercised more beneficially than when he induced his own followers, and even Mr. Parnell's fellow-countrymen, to throw over the Irish chief. Gladstonian politicians, Home Rule priests, the great majority even of the Parnellite puppets, at once obeyed Mr. Gladstone, and vied with each other in denouncing the man before

whom they had lately grovelled. The exhibition was not edifying; but the result, we repeat, has been beneficial in the highest degree to the country; for the separate action of the Irish party, outside and beyond the influence of the great party divisions by which British opinion is divided, has received a blow from which it will not recover for a generation. The fall of the Irish leader was rapid. First of all, the knowledge of his private character 'chilled the 'enthusiasm' of Gladstonian electors; then Mr. Gladstone renounced him as an ally; and, forthwith, the whole party in the press and on the platform set themselves to demonstrate, with unanswerable force, that it was impossible to trust Mr. Parnell! It is very curious to observe how personal to Mr. Parnell was the power of the Parnellite party. Without him it was ready at once to give up the whip-hand of the position. For Gladstonian purposes it was an immense gain to transform some fifty Parnellite members into an equal number of more or less faithful Gladstonians; but it was death to the Parnellite policy of the last fifteen years—viz. of using the Irish nationality as a power independent of English parties, and, by balancing the latter one against the other, to control the game.

The long experience of English history proves the tendency of Parliament to become divided into two political divisions. That, it can hardly be doubted, is the permanent characteristic of our party system; and, from what we have seen abroad, we have no reason to suppose that Government by means of Parliamentary groups would be an efficient substitute. The course of the present Parliament has shown, year after year, an improved understanding of each other's objects by Liberal Unionists and Conservatives, an increased power of useful co-operation for general political objects between the leaders of the Parliamentary parties, and also between the rank and file of the two sections of Unionists both in the House of Commons and the country. On the other hand, as we have just seen, there is every reason to suppose that for practical purposes the Irish Home Rule party will soon become little more than an advanced wing of the miscellaneous host which at present in somewhat irregular fashion surges after the standard of Mr. Gladstone. A century ago, the dissentient Whigs of that day, the Duke of Portland, Mr. Windham, Lord Spencer, Lord Fitzwilliam, and the rest, began by giving an independent support to the Government of Mr. Pitt. In more modern times the friends of Sir Robert Peel dissociated themselves from the Tory

party. Each group in its day, as is now admitted by impartial men, rendered the highest services to the State. Yet neither the Portland Whigs nor the Peelites established permanent political parties. As time went on, men whose political objects were the same were almost forced to coalesce; and ultimately an independent alliance developed into complete union. Political divisions were drawn upon new lines; but the normal condition of Parliamentary strife reasserted itself in the renewal of the political struggle between two great organised parties. In our own day parties have since 1885 been passing through a period of transition, and it is now beginning to become pretty clear how this transitional period is to end. In 1892 the dividing line of party politics will be a very different one from that which divided Whigs and Tories, Liberals and Conservatives, down to the date when Mr. Gladstone allied his party with the man whom he declared to be 'marching through rapine to 'the disintegration and dismemberment of the Empire.' There will, however, unless we are greatly mistaken, be but one dividing line throughout the United Kingdom on either side of which active politicians and political opinions will range themselves.

This assuredly is a mighty victory for the principle of Unionism. Irish members and Irishmen, whether in Great Britain or Ireland, are British citizens. It is right that they should combine with their fellow-citizens in England and Scotland to obtain objects which they all have at heart. Let Irishmen and Englishmen combine; let them give and take and compromise if need be; but do not let us again see an Irish national party in a position to dictate terms by virtue of its very aloofness from all sympathy with the general objects, dear to Englishmen and Scotchmen, and relying, not upon co-operation with them, but on the support drawn from the enemies of Great Britain beyond the Atlantic. The substantial union of the English and Irish Home Rulers will, of course, still further transform the principles of the so-called 'Liberal' party. It will become, in its constituent elements and in the leaders who represent it, a party very unlike any that the country has yet seen; it will no doubt suffer further secessions. On its front bench will sit the men who really influence its views, not the merely official representatives of an older tradition that has passed away. There will be much in this which men, especially Liberals, will regret. But the compensation is great; for, if the old Liberal party is to disappear, the existence of a political

party and power in the House of Commons avowedly hostile to the British nation will also come to an end.

The effect of Mr. Parnell's fall is as yet only beginning to be felt, and we would invite our readers to consider party tendencies during the last few years. The old-fashioned habit of regarding the two parties, into which politicians and the public generally have been divided, was, of course, to consider the one as the party of progress, the other as the party of resistance to change. A Tory Government had, no doubt, in 1829 carried Catholic Emancipation, another had in 1846 carried the repeal of the Corn Laws, a third had in 1867 carried a Democratic Reform Bill. But still the general public conception of Tory policy remained unchanged—and rightly so—for these examples only served to show that obstinate resistance, based upon vehemently asserted principle, was not incompatible with ultimate humiliating surrender and the unwilling acceptance of the policy of their opponents. Whilst, therefore, the 'Tories owned no argument but force,' it was still the boast of the Whigs that they, at all events, 'allowed no 'force but argument.' Are these opposite characteristics found to distinguish the political parties of to-day? We presume that even Home Rulers would not themselves select for special praise their strength in 'argument.' The 'classes 'and the masses,' the 'Union of Hearts,' the loyal statesmanship of Mr. Parnell, the stupidity of Tories, and the wickedness of Liberal Unionists are themes which, perhaps, they have been wise in preferring to any attempt to enlarge upon the nature, the merits, and the probable working of that Home Rule scheme which, it seems, is not to be submitted to public inspection till a Parliamentary majority, without having seen it, is pledged irrevocably in its favour! Two or three years ago, if we remember rightly, a distinguished Home Rule member of Parliament addressed to his chief some pointed questions on the nature of Home Rule, and Professor Freeman, in an article in a magazine, having, as an earnest Home Ruler, been a good deal shocked at the notion of federalising the institutions, either of the United Kingdom or of the British Empire, expressed a desire for more light. It is a peculiarity of the Home Rule movement, that whenever a humble follower of Mr. Gladstone (and his English followers are very humble) wishes, in the most guarded manner in the world, to put a question about the great object of the party to the sole depositary of knowledge on that subject, do what he will, his question

presents itself less as an honest interrogatory than as an insoluble conundrum, if not, indeed, a dangerous pitfall. Mr. Gladstone, accordingly, amidst the cheers of the faithful, refuses to walk into the trap. The few inquiring minds amongst his followers remain unsatisfied. But, whether satisfied or not, they follow with equal docility, whilst their great leader boasts that he is too well versed in the cunning fence of party warfare to think of trusting the British people with his plans for remodelling the British constitution!

This may be wise. It may be right. We have our opinion on both points; but for the moment we content ourselves with pointing out that, wise or foolish, right or wrong, it is certainly not argument, and that it was in argument that Whigs and Liberals of an earlier day boasted their superiority to their opponents.

Whilst Mr. Gladstone and his friends have abandoned argument, the old weapon of those whose principles they have deserted, but whose name they struggle to retain, the Conservatives have freed themselves from that spirit of dogged resistance to change which was the old characteristic of the Tory party. How great—nay, how rapid—has been the progress made by the nation since 1886 will be pointed out later. No one can avoid seeing that the national advance has been along those very lines which in the past were dear to advanced Liberals. It is a mistake to suppose that this change in the spirit and attitude of political Conservatism is due solely to the alliance of their forces with a powerful section of the Liberal Party. The necessity of co-operating with such statesmen as Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain was, indeed, a guarantee against any indulgence of the old Tory spirit. Any evidence of this would have at once put an end to the *entente cordiale* which has been so usefully maintained. The old Liberal and Radical habit of searching for a remedy wherever grievances exist, and of not shrinking from measures of the most far-reaching character, if they seemed likely to prove remedial, has marked the rule of the present administration as strongly as that of any of its Liberal predecessors. It has been a Government of reform no less than a Government of law and order. And we think that the mighty change is due not less to the intrinsic modification of the spirit of Conservatism than to the cordial co-operation between Liberals and Conservatives, which has, of course, worked to the same end.

The effect of successive Democratic Reform Bills has

brought about, on the whole, as great a change in Conservatism as in Radicalism. Since these great modifications of our political system were accomplished, it has ceased to be possible for any political party to base itself upon resistance to reform, or upon the maintenance of privilege. Tory statesmen, of necessity, have to appeal for support to the same democracy which is invoked by their opponents. How great the change has been may be judged when we observe the very different quarters from which Unionism, as compared with old Toryism, draws its support. The strength of Toryism used to lie in the counties, where, under the 'Chandos 'Clause,' the system of open voting, and the semi-feudal sentiment of farmers towards their landlords, Tory magnates and squires held sway. In 1886, under household franchise, the immense majority of Great Britain in favour of the Union was largely due to the decided views of the borough constituencies, where it might have been supposed that 'the 'masses' would prevail. Thus the boroughs of England, Scotland, and Wales returned to the Parliament of 1886 177 Unionists against 91 Home Rulers—a remarkable result when the strength of the Irish vote in many boroughs is taken into account. In the metropolis alone, out of 61 seats, 50 fell to the Unionists. In the counties of Great Britain the Unionist majority was almost as large. It seems to be the tendency for modern Conservatism to improve its position in the boroughs, even should it lose its hold somewhat in the rural districts. This is a change worthy of note. Nowadays it is numbers only that tell. To build upon the support of a class, or of a church, for instance, unless it has on its side the bulk of the nation, is to court defeat. Class prejudices and the defence of social privileges formed a strong backing to a political party in the days when the classes and the privileged possessed more power than comes from their mere numbering per head in the polling booth against the rest of the community. The popular voice is the only real power that remains, and no political party can claim a prescriptive right to monopolise the privilege of carrying out the will of the people. The spirit of old Toryism still animates individuals, but it is no longer a living force which can direct one of the great parties in the State. It thus happened that, at the time when Mr. Gladstone's action drove from his party in large numbers thoughtful and able men of every class in the community, Conservatives were themselves feeling the influence of the times, and were becoming ready to advance

along those very paths of progress which hitherto all but Liberals and Radicals had feared to tread. The alliance which the resistance to Home Rule necessitated caused, for this reason, far less strain either upon Conservatives or Liberal Unionists than was anticipated. On one or two subjects, doubtless, extreme Conservatives and faddist Liberals have been dissatisfied, and grumbling has been heard, on one side and the other, against radical innovations and publican endowment budgets; but, on the whole, the Unionist alliance has worked successfully, for the reason that for the most part Conservatives and Liberal Unionists have *thought* and *felt* together upon the great questions of the day. They have had the same aspirations—the same ends in view. It has not been a case of Liberals dragging on Tories against their will towards Reform, nor of Conservatives having to coax Liberals into supporting legislation necessary for the restoration of law and order. The sweeping measure of Mr. Ritchie was supported with heartiness by modern Conservatism, and Mr. Balfour's fixed determination to make law victorious in Ireland received the enthusiastic approval of Liberal Unionists. The conduct of the Ministry has, speaking generally, given the greatest satisfaction to the bulk of the Unionist party. To say that there have been discontented knots of members within the House and grumbling individuals outside it is only to say that which might have been said—and has been said—of every party which has ever governed this country.

When a Ministry, after holding office for several years, appeals to the people, electors ask themselves the question, How has the country benefited by their rule? What is the position of the nation now, compared with its position when they undertook the conduct of its affairs? It is a common mistake to suppose that the electorate has regard to promises only; though, doubtless, the newly enfranchised portion of the electorate has to learn, by the experience which time only can bring, the much greater facility of obtaining promises from candidates than performance of good and useful work by the party to which these gentlemen belong. A long reign of five or six years does much to create or to maintain the character of a party; and, even though a dissolution may terminate that reign, this character will stand the defeated party in good stead with the electorate should their successors in office be less skilful or less fortunate than themselves. In the long run the character of a party tells with overpowering effect upon the

constituencies as a whole, though at first its influence is, as might be expected, more noticeable amongst the instructed few than with the mass of the electors. In the long run, in short, good work counts for more than fair words. When Mr. Gladstone left office in 1884, he could not look back with much satisfaction on his four years' rule. He had, however, passed a sweeping measure of reform, the newly enfranchised rallied to his standard, and his appeal for a majority so large as to keep his party free from the necessity of truckling to Irish Home Rule told strongly with the old electorate. The eyes of men were thus diverted from the contemplation of an unsatisfactory past to that of a hopeful future. These hopes were dashed to the ground by the great surrender of 1886.

When, at the present moment, the constituencies turn their eyes backwards to the years 1885 and 1886, and compare the state of the nation then with its condition now, they cannot fail to see that success and progress have strongly characterised the period which has since elapsed. It has been a time of peace with the outside world and a time of national growth at home. History will count the Parliament of 1886 a great Parliament, and Lord Salisbury's administration one of the most successful of the present reign.

As regards Ireland we may apply what test we choose. In every direction statistics prove the increased prosperity of the people. Increase of business on the Irish railways, both as regards passengers and goods, increased balances in Irish banks, an increase of some 25 per cent. in the last five years shown in the balances of Irish savings banks, agrarian crime diminished by one-half, evictions greatly decreased in number, and boycotting almost wholly abolished—all this tells the same tale, the return of prosperity with a revived feeling of confidence in the law. And with this there is, throughout the length and breadth of Ireland, greater and not less personal liberty and freedom than existed in those evil days when law was paralysed, when juries and witnesses were intimidated, when men could not regulate their own business, could not buy and sell in a public market, could not, in short, live their own lives unless they obeyed the edicts of that League which was in truth a political conspiracy organised 'to bring about the absolute independence 'of Ireland as a separate nation.'*

* Report of the Judges, Parnell Commission.

Mr. Balfour and the Government have kept steadily in view a great policy for putting on a surer foundation the system of the ownership and occupation of land in Ireland; and, in spite of much criticism and delay (which proved fatal to their Bill in 1890), their scheme this session has become law. It is unnecessary to particularise in any detail the provisions of this most important measure. It is many years since Mr. John Stuart Mill urged the desirability, and, indeed, necessity, of creating in Ireland a cultivating proprietary, and since Mr. John Bright obtained the recognition of Parliament for this policy in clauses of the Irish Church Act. It was a policy originally and for many years dear almost solely to advanced Liberals; but which, since the Irish Land Act of 1881, has enlisted a continually increasing support from Conservatives. That Act, though announced as a mere amendment of the Land Act of 1870, adopted as its basis the three F's, viz. Fair Rents, Fixity of Tenure, and Free Sale, and, indeed, went far to convert Irish landlords from owners into mere rent chargers on the land. In the absolute deadlock that was reached in 1881—in the war, or, at least, general suspension of friendly relations between landlords and tenants—much reason was found for the direct intervention of the State as a kind of arbitrator between the contending classes; and, accordingly, Parliament established Rent Courts, for the purpose of settling between landlords and tenants those incidents of tenure which, in a healthy condition of public feeling, are best left to the parties themselves. That this legislation, however necessary at the time, would settle the Irish Land Question, was apparently the belief of the Prime Minister. It was a belief, however, which was by no means universally held by his followers. Indeed, Lord Hartington showed a much more statesmanlike appreciation of the probable working of the Land Bill of 1881, when he advocated it rather as a 'modus vivendi,' by means of which Ireland was to tide over an evil time, than as a permanent settlement of Irish land troubles. Ultimately, he hoped that, by a large conversion of occupiers into owners, a healthy land system would become possible. By the two Ashbourne Acts, and Mr. Balfour's great measure of last session, Lord Hartington's anticipations of ten years ago are being realised. As a result of this legislation, Irish tenants have been granted pecuniary advantages such as are enjoyed by no other class of the community in this or any country of the world. By an extension in his favour of the hand of

Imperial credit, the Irish farmer is enabled to have that very rent which has been fixed as a fair rent by a rent court still further reduced, and converted into an annuity payable to the State. Subject to this payment he becomes at once owner of the land, and after forty-nine years the annuity ceases altogether, and his land is absolutely his own, free from every burden which he has not himself created. No stronger illustration could be given of the power and readiness of the Imperial Parliament to effect in the interest of Ireland beneficial reforms which no local Irish legislature could by any possibility achieve. Mr. Balfour has further succeeded in carrying through his scheme for establishing and furnishing with funds a congested districts board, which, by consolidating small holdings, by assisting emigration and migration, by providing, under certain circumstances, seed potatoes and oats, and by improving and developing local industries, will be able in a systematic manner to accomplish much which it was impossible for previous spasmodic efforts to effect. The Congested Districts Board has to grapple with a condition of almost chronic distress. The energy and success with which the Chief Secretary has laboured on behalf of the distressed peasantry, the employment he has been able to provide for them, and the assistance he has afforded them in a dark day, seem to be gradually meeting with recognition amongst the Irish poor, in spite of the strenuous efforts of political opponents to prevent any manifestations of popular gratitude and appreciation. The attempt to represent Mr. Balfour as a heartless tyrant has broken down, and the violent attacks made upon him and his administration by English and Irish politicians, which were popular with certain classes a few years ago, no longer find place in speeches on Home Rule platforms.

So much for Ireland. Let us turn to the general interests of the United Kingdom.

It was a fortunate day for the country when Mr. Goschen undertook the charge of the national finances. In December 1886 the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was also leader of the House of Commons, resigned; and the grounds on which he acted have never been explained to the public in a manner to justify in their eyes so strange and unexpected a proceeding. The times were in the highest degree critical; the strength of the alliance between the Ministry and the Liberal Unionists had hardly yet been proved, and there was much reason to fear that the withdrawal from office of

Lord Randolph Churchill would bring about the fall of the Ministry. With that statesman the 'Union of the Unionist 'Party' had been the favourite watchword, yet in January 1887 he explained to the House of Commons that he could no longer act with ministers who were determined to spend money upon the defence of our commercial ports and naval stations, and whose foreign relations were conducted in a meddlesome and reckless spirit, which was calculated before long to embroil Great Britain with the Great Powers of Europe. Patriotism and conscience compelled Lord Randolph Churchill to sever his connexion with the extravagant and rash Government of Lord Salisbury. Mr. Goschen took his place in the Cabinet. It is certainly curious that the very matters upon the mismanagement of which the retiring minister insisted, viz. sound financial administration and a peaceful foreign policy, are those about which during the last five years professional critics of the Government have found least to say. Lord Salisbury's conduct of our foreign relations has been singularly firm and successful, and it would be difficult to point to any period of five years in which there had been less fussy interference in continental affairs, whilst throughout, the interests, the influence, and the dignity of Great Britain have been duly maintained. Attempts have indeed been made, but not by responsible statesmen, to show that the future freedom of action of this country has been hampered by engagements thoughtlessly entered into with the military Powers of Europe. The charge has, however, hardly been seriously pressed, and Lord Salisbury has on more than one occasion taken the opportunity of pointing out that the action of nations is much more often determined by their interests than by the diplomatic bargains they may have previously entered into. For instance, should future complications arise, the relations between France and Russia and Germany and Great Britain will depend upon their interests and the circumstances of the time. When the crisis comes, secret treaties and private understandings, even should they exist, will be of much less weight in the balance. The influence of Great Britain has constantly been exerted in the interests of European peace, and it requires no supposition of secret treaties to justify the belief that our cordial relations with the German empire tend strongly to preserve it.

It was, however, the reckless expenditure of the Government that had mainly raised the ire of the outgoing guardian of the public purse. In his letter of resignation to the Prime

Minister of December 22, 1886, he informed Lord Salisbury that his study of the national finances had brought him to the conclusion 'that only the sacrifice of a Chancellor of the 'Exchequer upon the altar of thrift and economy could rouse 'the people to take stock of their leaders, their position, and 'their future.' Once more, however, the experience of five years has proved the unreality of the gloomy forebodings which weighed upon the mind of Lord Randolph Churchill. That statesman was undoubtedly right in desiring the strictest supervision of departmental expenditure, both for the purpose of keeping down estimates, and for the still more important object of securing that the nation should get proper value for what was spent. Here there was scope for abundant energy. Unfortunately, Lord Randolph Churchill contented himself with a protest against the large totals of military and naval expenditure. Thirty-one millions, he declared, was too large a sum. Yet his only proposal for its reduction was the abandonment of the plan too long neglected for rendering secure our commercial ports and coaling stations. The Cabinet rightly declined to risk important national interests, even to retain so powerful a colleague, and the British public approved their decision. The truth is that our modern democracy shows no desire to 'scrimp' the services; and indeed the policy of strengthening the military and naval position of the country has more than once, in recent years, been forced upon a reluctant Ministry by the public sense of the national requirements. Neither in the House of Commons nor on the platform are now heard those denunciations of bloated armaments which once formed a large portion of the staple rhetoric of popular orators. A Chancellor of the Exchequer who can show that he has lightened taxation where its pressure has been most felt, that he has reduced debt, that he has employed the national resources in the best interests of the people, and that he has *not* diminished the defensive forces of the empire, need fear little criticism from his political opponents. All this Mr. Goschen has been able to effect beyond any of his predecessors. Amongst Chancellors of the Exchequer of the last half of the nineteenth century, Mr. Gladstone alone will leave a greater or indeed an equal name.

The account which Mr. Goschen gave last April of the financial progress of the nation was eminently satisfactory. During the present Parliament the capital of the national debt has been reduced by more than thirty-seven millions, a

larger amount than has ever before been paid off in an equal length of time. By Mr. Goschen's conversion scheme, the annual interest of the debt was reduced at once by one and a half millions; whilst in the year 1903 a further reduction of an equal amount will begin. He has taken 2*d.* in the 1*l.* off the income tax, 4*d.* in the pound off tobacco, 2*d.* in the pound off tea, he has reduced the duty upon currants and raisins from 7*s.* to 2*s.* per cwt., he has removed altogether the duty on workmen's houses under 20*l.* a year, and diminished it on houses of less than 60*l.* a year. On the other hand, by the creation of his estate duty, a burden has been placed upon the owners of substantial property, and by the increase of the duties on spirits and beer he has largely augmented the national income without apparently depressing the trade in alcohol; for last year's consumption of alcoholic drinks exceeded what has ever before been achieved by this thirsty nation. The returns of the customs pointed to a steady revival of trade; 'the year 1890 had topped all others 'in regard to the profits of the employer and the wages of 'the employed, and 1*d.* in the 1*l.* on the income tax produces '2,300,000*l.* per annum.'

We are, of course, dealing only with the more salient features of Mr. Goschen's financial administration, amongst which must be mentioned the employment of his prospective surpluses for public purposes of a novel kind, rather than for the sole purpose of reducing taxation. This perhaps should be treated rather as part of the general policy of the Government than as the special action of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whose skill has been shown in finding the ways and means for this expenditure rather than determining its direction. The relief of local taxation, the starting of the new county councils, and, above all, the introduction of free education, have made calls upon the public purse for which few Chancellors of the Exchequer would have been able to provide. It is hardly necessary to look further than the financial policy of the ministry to see how little there has been of the old spirit of Toryism, how little there has been of any preference for 'the classes' over 'the masses' since the income and expenditure of the nation have been entrusted to the able management of Mr. Goschen.

It would be tedious to describe the many measures of a beneficial character passed by the present Parliament. They were not passed without much effort and perseverance; for the majority had on various occasions to cope with determined obstruction rather than with frank opposition. To

show that the majority could not legislate was the avowed object of some Opposition leaders. But Parliamentary obstruction, though it achieved temporary success, has, on the whole, been vanquished. Here we wish to call the attention of our readers to the manner in which the present Parliament has treated those greater questions upon which its character in history will depend. On all these subjects, views which a few years ago would have been considered distinctly 'Liberal' have been in the ascendant. We can find no trace of the cloven hoof of 'Old Toryism' in the foreign policy, or the finance, or the domestic legislation of Lord Salisbury's Government. The great measures of Local Government passed for England and Scotland were the statutory embodiment of a democratic principle, long ago recognised in our urban communities. The government of counties has been withdrawn from the justices of the peace, nominated by the Crown, and entrusted to representatives elected upon the widest of franchises. In Parliament hardly any difference of principle arose between the two parties. Discussion was largely confined to details, and a sweeping change in our constitution was effected with far less public excitement than has often been aroused by much less important reforms.

Is it too much to hope that the discussion next Session of a Local Government Bill for Ireland will be similarly confined to the discussion of practical details? Already Home Rulers pretend to see in the announcement of an Irish Local Government Bill a concession to the principle of Home Rule! Yet no one thought of detecting, either in the English or the Scottish Bill, any trace of an intention to set up Home Rule either in England or Scotland. In truth the two things are essentially distinct. Home Rule is nothing at all unless it is based upon the principle, avowed or concealed, of building up a nation with national institutions, national rights, and national privileges of its own. Parnellites and anti-Parnellites have been proved to be aiming at the establishment of a separate Irish nation. Indeed, most of them have often made this their proudest boast. Local Government deals with the administration of *local*, as distinct from, or indeed contrasted with, national affairs. When in 1884 Mr. Gladstone hoped to bring forward a reform of Local Government, he defined the expression in a paragraph of the Queen's speech at the opening of Parliament: 'Local 'Government embraces all that relates locally to the greater 'efficiency of administration, to the alleviation of burdens 'by improved arrangements, and to the enlargement of the

'powers of ratepayers through the representative system.' The difference between Home Rule and Local Government is thus not one of degree, but of kind; for, whilst the former involves questions of national sovereignty, the latter is concerned only with local administration. A matter of detail of great importance will, it is clear, be sharply contested in Mr. Balfour's Bill next Session. Two years ago Mr. Gladstone declared that the control of the police was 'the gem' of Local Government; and no great foresight is required to anticipate the glowing indignation with which the refusal of this control to the local councils will be denounced by Mr. Gladstone's colleagues. Of course no responsible ministry could possibly give the control of the police force to authorities which could not be trusted to maintain the law. The police force is not employed either in Ireland or Great Britain solely or mainly for the enforcement of local administration. The law of the land enacted by Parliament, the orders and decrees of courts of law, local or supreme, if they meet with resistance are enforced by the police, who are thus, as regards the duties they perform, the servants of the supreme executive, representing the national will rather than of any local authority. Nevertheless the public will be assured that it is the determined resolution of a tyrannical British Government to deny to Irishmen the ordinary rights of free citizenship; and Opposition orators, whilst rolling out sentences of portentous constitutional solemnity, will conveniently forget that the condition of slavery to which Irishmen are to be consigned is only that abject state of serfdom in which the five millions of the British metropolis spend their lives.

When the various measures enacted by the present Parliament are passed in review, when the British elector contrasts his condition and the position of his country now with the state of things existing five years ago, he cannot but recognise that the nation has grown with the lapse of time. He sees that it has been an era of peace and of progress. He is a citizen of a richer nation; one which has less debt, one where the poor are less taxed, yet which possesses a more powerful army and navy than ever before. He has grown also in the privileges of citizenship. In county, as in borough, he chooses the managers of his local affairs. In short, his country is richer, stronger, more popularly governed than it used to be. He has enjoyed five years of order, of peace, and of progress, and of progress of the very kind most dear to men who hold the principles of the

Liberal or Radical party. Hence all Liberals, who are not Home Rulers, are cordial in their support of the Unionist Government.

Thus the action of the present Parliament has consolidated the Unionist alliance. What has it done for Home Rule and for Home Rulers? It is hardly too much to say that as a practical policy it has destroyed it. Home Rule, as a useful phrase, remains; but it survives for the purpose of giving a semblance of unity to politicians amongst whom no real union of political principle exists, not for the purpose of being translated into a statute for the establishment of a separate Parliament and Executive Government in Ireland. A great policy for fundamentally changing the constitution of the country, urged as it has been upon the people by a statesman of unrivalled experience, cannot remain stationary for some half dozen years. It must either have been gaining ground or losing it. In 1886 Mr. Gladstone believed that the House of Commons would pass the second reading of his Home Rule Bill. After its defeat he still proudly asserted that 'it held the field.' At the end of 1891 no one knows better than Mr. Gladstone that the production by him of *any* Home Rule Bill would be death to his hopes of a Home Rule majority. If in 1886 the Gladstonian Home Rule Bill held the field, it is quite certain that neither in England nor in Ireland, before the general election, will a Gladstonian Home Rule Bill dare to show its face. Public opinion is, in short, hostile to Home Rule; and Home Rule leaders and Home Rule whips are perfectly aware of the fact. In the improbable event of Mr. Gladstone obtaining a majority at the next general election, it will be possible for him to unsettle much—the relations between Great Britain and Ireland will be rendered difficult, progress in Ireland will be stayed—but neither he nor any other statesman will be able to pass a law for the severance of the Parliaments and Governments of these two islands. The stand made in 1886 has given the people time, and the British people are determined that the British Islands shall remain united under a single Parliament and Government. The battle has been a hard one, and doubtless there are still some troubles to be endured, and even some fighting to be done. Nevertheless, the victory has substantially been already won. It is very seldom that a statesman has the satisfaction of bringing about so completely the realisation of his hopes as has been the case with Lord Hartington. He wished to maintain the Union. It has been maintained. He believed in the

possibility and necessity of enforcing law in Ireland. It has been enforced. He hoped for steady constitutional progress and reform under the ministry of Lord Salisbury, and this has been achieved. The objects of the Liberal Unionist party have throughout the present Parliament been attained more thoroughly than it was reasonable to anticipate, and it is but natural that the complete vindication of their action, and the success which has rewarded their efforts, should provoke the wrath of the men whose policy they have exposed, and whose aims they have defeated.

Amongst English and Scotch adherents of the Home Rule party, apart from the Irish question, disintegration rather than consolidation has been at work. There is among them no common principle, and, in the constant absence of Mr. Gladstone, no leader to whom the party as a whole is willing to defer. It is worthy of remark that so little confidence is felt by many of the rank and file of that party in their official leaders on matters of general policy, that they have formed themselves into a separate organisation with their own leaders and their own whips. This bears witness to what is no doubt a passing phase in the history of the present Opposition; but it portends, in all probability, further rupture and disorganisation amongst Liberals and Radicals before that party again finds itself in a condition of stable equilibrium, with leaders that it can trust, and followers who are prepared to follow.

No Parliament can last for five years without some light being thrown on the fitness of our public men to serve or lead the nation. Some steadily grow, whilst others as steadily lose ground, in the public confidence. Mr. Balfour's character as a statesman has been acquired since the last general election. His firmness and courage in administration, his skill in debate, his active sympathy with real Irish trouble and distress, his power of exposing for public instruction the dramatic shams of political agitation, his determination to wrestle boldly with great evils, his desire where there is a grievance to find a remedy, are now universally recognised. These qualities have placed him in the front rank of our public men. Mr. Goschen, again, for long honourably a stranger to office, and who by joining the ministry in 1887 probably saved it from falling to pieces, has made its career memorable by his financial ability. The position of Lord Hartington remains altogether a unique one in politics. Respected and trusted on all sides, the country looks to his advice with ever-increasing reliance. Mr.

Chamberlain, as a debater, has proved himself second only to Mr. Gladstone. His constancy to his Unionist principles, his courage and his power over men, have been alike conspicuous in the troubled times upon which he has fallen. And the present Parliament, in his case, only affords additional evidence that, whether in or out of office, he will continue to be one of the statesmen who really take part in the 'government' of the country. But when the Prime Minister and these statesmen have been named, who remain? How has the House of Commons elected in 1886 affected the public position of Mr. Gladstone, of Lord Randolph Churchill, of Sir William Harcourt, of Mr. John Morley, of Sir George Trevelyan? There are, of course, in the ministry and in opposition many able administrators and capable men; but there are not many to whose individuality as members of a Government the country attaches great importance. Mr. Gladstone, as time has gone on, has naturally withdrawn himself more and more from the active duties incumbent upon a leader of the Opposition; and as he has withdrawn into the background, his lieutenants have come to the fore. Yet it can hardly be said that the parliamentary record, or public career, of Sir William Harcourt and Mr. Morley since 1886 afford much reason for thinking that to their guidance, either jointly or severally, the country would be either wise or willing to entrust its destinies. Of course, these statesmen may possess qualities which, when they are better known, will entitle them to the confidence of sober-minded men. We are not speculating about the future. We are observing the evidence afforded by the course of events of the last few years, and this leads us to the conclusion that more and more the party of Home Rule has become identified with the personal leadership of Mr. Gladstone. As in 1886, so in 1891, it is the public admiration and respect for Mr. Gladstone that alone floats Home Rule. Yet it will not be to the years since 1886 that future biographers of Mr. Gladstone will direct the attention of his admirers.

We have briefly called attention to the career of a remarkable Parliament now near its end. We have glanced at the spirit which has actuated it, at the measures it has passed, at the men whose political careers it has tended to make or to mar. Perhaps after all its most important achievement has consisted in the punishment which it has inflicted on the departure by hot-headed party leaders from the beaten constitutional path of British statesmen. In this country, in modern times, it has been an accepted

principle by every political party that constitutional means existed and might alone be had recourse to for the redress of grievances. This, of course, was not the case in the troubled times of early English history; it has not been the case in other countries even in modern times. But in England, and at the present day, it had come to be recognised as an axiom that however much a statesman or a party might disapprove the laws of the land, they might neither disobey them nor defy them. Their duty was to seek by constitutional means to amend or to repeal them. With this distinguishing principle of our time and country Opposition leaders have played fast and loose. Mr. Forster charged Mr. Parnell to his face that he had either connived at outrages and murders, 'or that when warned with facts 'and statements, he had determined to remain in ignorance; 'that he took no trouble to test the truth of whether these 'outrages had been committed or not, but that he was 'willing to gain the advantage of them.' Mr. Gladstone and Sir William Harcourt have said very nearly if not quite as much. Yet till yesterday Mr. Parnell was the chosen instrument by which the Gladstonian party hoped to accomplish its ends. The fraudulent and illegal Plan of Campaign was the work of Messrs. Dillon and O'Brien, at the present moment Mr. Gladstone's closest allies. Sir Walter Scott, in describing the many virtues and high objects of some at all events of the Girondist leaders in the French Revolution, pointed out 'that to the disgrace of 'their Republican virtue the Girondists were willing to 'employ, for the accomplishment of their purpose, those 'base and guilty tools which afterwards effected their own 'destruction.' They were for using the revolutionary means of insurrection and violence until the Republic should be established and no longer; or in the words of a satirist—

> 'For letting rapine loose, and murther,
> To rage just so far and no further;
> And setting all the land on fire
> To burn to a scantling, but no higher.'

The Unionist Parliament has served the country well, both in what it has done and in what it has prevented. The Unionist party has but to remain true to itself to receive once more from the country the confidence which its services deserve.

---

*No. CCCLIX. will be published in January,* 1892.

# INDEX.


## A

*Architecture of London in the Nineteenth Century*, review of books concerning, 152—changes since beginning of century, 152—new architectural era, 166—Houses of Parliament, 167—Government offices, 170—new Law Courts, 173—War and Admiralty offices, 176—First Exhibition, 177—Albert Memorial and Albert Hall, 178—Natural History Museum, 179—Imperial Institute, 180—Bank of England and Royal Exchange, 181—National Gallery and British Museum, 182—buildings on Victoria Embankment, 183—new bridges, 185—clubs, 186—monster hotels and houses in flats, 189—town mansions, 190—dwelling houses, 191—brick buildings, 192.

*Atkinson, J. C.*, his book about Cleveland reviewed, 328.

*Austria in* 1848–9, review of Count Hübner's book upon, 440—aged chiefs, 441—enmity in Lombardy towards Austria, 442—Italian national sentiment, 443—anti-tobacco riots, 444—revolution in Vienna, 445, 452—Milan in revolt, 446—Baron Hübner's narrow escape at Brescia, 448; prisoner on parole in Milan, 449—condition of Italy under Austrian rule, 450—Prince Felix von Schwarzenberg, 453—Socialist rising in Vienna, 455—Marshal Windischgrätz, suppresses the rebellion, 457—abdication of Emperor Ferdinand I., 460.

## B

*Beatrice of Dante, the*, review of works concerning, 57—conflicting theories as to her identity, 58—Boccaccio's statement, 61—Biscioni's theory, 62—Rossetti's allegorical interpretation, 63—Gietmann's symbolical theory, 64—Dante's first meeting with her, 65—meeting at a marriage feast, 68—death of her father, 69—her death, 70—Aroux's rhapsodical interpretation, 73—Scartazzini's opinion, 74—'ideal' theory, 75—arguments for a real and historical Beatrice, 81.

*Broglie, Duc de*, his edition of 'Memoirs of Talleyrand' reviewed, 1.

## C

*China, the Affairs of*, review of books concerning, 493—recent anti-foreign demonstrations, 494—Manchu conquest, 494—assimilation of conquerors and conquered, 496—preservation of Manchu language and military system, 497—futility of rebellion against reigning dynasty, 498—death of Prince Chun, 499—Emperor Kwangsu, 500—ex-empress regent, 503—Li Hung Chang, Viceroy

and Grand Secretary, 505—Viceroy Chang Che Tung, 509—Chang's opposition to railway, 511—causes of popular discontent, 512—competition of Indian with Chinese teas, 512—secret societies, 513—Kolao society, 514—inadequate pay of officials, 516—taxes, 517—inundations and famine, 518—foreign relations, 519—Imperial dilatoriness, 520—action of Treaty Powers, 521, 527—Russian policy, 522—General Gordon on strength of Pekin Government, 524—army and navy, 525.

*Clarke, Major G. S.*, his work on fortification reviewed, 404.

*Clerke, Agnes M.*, her 'System of the Stars' reviewed, 32.

*Cleveland, Parish of*, review of Mr. Atkinson's books concerning, 328—Danby-in-Cleveland, 329—origin of name, Cliff-land, 331—glories of scenery, 332—bird-life, 333—traces of prehistoric colonisation, 335—grave-mounds, 335—ancient defensive works, 338—Anglo-Danish words in Cleveland dialect, 340—fairies, 342—'Hobs,' 344—witches, 346—'wise man,' or anti-conjuror, 347.

*Colonial Independence*, review of works concerning, 221—change in relations between colonies and mother country during last fifty years, 223—nominal supremacy of Imperial Parliament, 226—independent action of colonies, 227—weakening of position of Governor, 229—links binding Empire together, 231—question of annexation of Canada by United States, 233—Imperial Federation, 236—customs union and union for common defence, 238—practical difficulties of federation, 239—tendencies towards colonial independence, 244.

D

*Davidson, Dean*, and Canon Benham, their life of Archbishop Tait reviewed, 462.

F

*Fortification*, review of Major Clarke's work on, 404—inland fortresses, 406—detached forts and redoubts, 407—the ditch, 410—*abattis*, 413—right use of fortification, 415—enceintes, 416—the keep, or *réduit*, 419—fortress of the future, 421—defence of London, 422—*rôle* of forts with heavy guns, 423—use of hasty entrenchments in American and Russo-Turkish wars, 425—effective range of infantry fire, 428—historical sieges of permanent fortresses, 430—recent proposals, 432—coast defence, 434—modern improvements in guns and mounting, 436.

*Fraser, Sir W.*, his 'Melville and Leven Memoirs' reviewed, 246.

G

*Gietmann, G.*, his work on Dante's Beatrice reviewed, 57.

*Goltz, Baron C. von der*, his 'Rosbach and Jena' reviewed, 528.

H

*Hübner, Comte de*, his 'Une Année de ma Vie' reviewed, 440.

I

*Individual, the, and the State*, review of essays and speeches upon, 271—'Social questions' the future 'New Liberal' platform, 274—Radical protests against State Socialism, 275—Mr. Herbert Spencer's plea for individual liberty, 277—co-operation, voluntary and compulsory, 278—Mr. Stanley Jevons on expediency of restrictions upon liberty, 282—legislative regulation of mining and shipping industries, 286—State superintendence of railways, 287—Eight Hours Bill and Labour Commission, 288—Lord Salisbury on scope of labour legislation, 289—Mr. Burt on fixing hours of adult labour, 290—gradual increase in State interference, 291.

K

*Kipling, Rudyard*, review of the tales of, 132—a born story-teller, 136—three classes of his short stories, 139—sketches of Indian society, 140—tales of military life, 142—pictures of childhood, 145—his novel, 'The Light that Failed,' 148—his style, 150.

L

*Lewal, General*, his book on Von Moltke reviewed, 528.
*Lockyer, J. N.*, his 'Meteoritic Hypothesis' reviewed, 32.
*Loftie, W. J.*, his 'History of London' reviewed, 152.
*Lowell, J. R.*, review of the writings of, 377—charm of his style, 379—'Biglow Papers,' 380, 395—'Moosehead Journal,' 381—descriptive power, 382—fertility of imagination, 384—satirical vein of humour, 385—intellectual friendships, 386—study of Dante, 388—admiration for Shakespeare, 390—essay on Spenser, 392—on Milton and Dryden, 393—'Fable for Critics,' 394—opinions upon war, 396—on slave scandal, 397—satires on time-servers, 397—second series of 'Biglow Papers,' 399—disquisition on language, 400—political addresses, 401—'My Garden Acquaintance,' 402.

M

*Mackay, T.*, his 'Plea for Liberty' reviewed, 271.
*Melvilles, Earls of, and Earls of Leven*, review of memoirs by Sir W. Fraser, 246—origin of name of Melville, 247—early Melvilles of Midlothian and of Raith, 248—Sir James Melville of Hallhill, 253, 256, 259—Sir Robert Melville and Queen Mary, 253, 257—Alexander Leslie, first earl of Leven, 261—George, Lord Melville of Monimail, 264—David, third earl of Leven, 267.
*Moltke, Field-Marshal von*, review of works and memoirs, 528—expansion of Brandenburg electorate into German Empire, 530—aged Prussian generals, 533—trio of Von Moltke, Von Roon, and Bismarck, 537—Von Moltke's 'Letters on the East,' 537, 539—boyhood and school life, 539—military service with Turks against Ibrahim Pasha, 539—slow promotion, 540—work on Russo-Turkish war of 1828-9, 542—literary ability, 543—tenderness of feeling, 545—historical sketch of Poland, 546—speeches in Reichstag, 547—

opinions on Socialism, 548—military genius, 549—'organiser of victory,' 552—genius as director of war, 554—vigorous offensive strategy, 557—handling of three armies in Franco-German war, 558—decision of character, 563—value of his services to Germany, 564.

*Morris*, W. O'C., his 'Great Commanders of Modern Times' reviewed, 528.

*Muller, Prof. W.*, his book on Von Moltke reviewed, 528.

*Murray, John*, review of Mr. Smiles's edition of his correspondence, 121—his early business connexions, 122—becomes publisher of 'Edinburgh Review,' 123—founds 'Quarterly Review,' 125—his editor, Mr. Gifford, 127—connexion with Lord Byron, 128—publishes 'Childe Harold,' 129—cremates Byron's 'Memoirs,' 130—intimacy with Disraeli family, 130.

P

*Parker, C. S.*, his edition of Sir R. Peel's correspondence reviewed, 295.

*Parliament, the Twelfth, of the Queen*, review of the work of, 566—relative strength of parties, 566—Unionist Alliance, 568—Mr. Parnell, 569—end of Gladstone-Parnell alliance, 570—rearrangement of political divisions, 572—inscrutability of Gladstonian policy, 574—effect of democratic Reform Bills, 576—practical results of Unionist rule, 577—Ireland, 578—Irish Land Act, 579—Lord Randolph Churchill's resignation, 581—Mr. Goschen's successful finance, 582—Government achievements in legislation, 584—fate of Home Rule, 586—Unionist statesmen, 587.

*Peel, Sir Robert*, his private correspondence reviewed, 295—early life, 297—M.P. for Cashel, 298—Chief Secretary for Ireland, 292—Catholic Emancipation question, 300—opposes Catholic Emancipation, 307—M.P. for Oxford University, 310—dislike for O'Connell, 311—efforts to reduce corruption in Irish patronage, 311—opinions on evils of Irish life, 317—organises a police force for Ireland and attempts to institute unsectarian national schools, 318—tithe question, 319—Home Minister, 320—his legislation for diminishing capital offences, 322—his Church patronage, 323—opinions on Catholic Emancipation, 324.

*Phœnicia*, review of Canon Rawlinson's work on, 88—geographical position, 88—ships, 89—circumnavigation of Africa, 91—Hanno's voyage to Gold Coast, 91—trade in tin, 92—Ophir and Tarshish, 93—gold, 94—ivory and purple, 94—navy, 96—Hannibal's overland march to Italy, 96—Hannibal's successes, 97—fall of Carthage, 98—language Semitic, 99—origin of alphabet, 100—earliest historic notice, 101—religion, 102—circumcision, 105—belief in future state, 106—knowledge of the name of Jehovah, 106—calendar, 107—architecture and art, 108—mason's marks, 110—temples, 111—statues, 112—artisans and artists, 113—slave trade, 116—fauna, 117—government, 119—antiquity of civilisation, 119.

Q

*Quakerism*, review of books concerning, 194—early eccentricities, 195—doctrine of Inner Light, 199—quiet developement, 202—Quaker dress, 203—philanthropical labours, 203—number of members in seventeenth century, 205—falling off in eighteenth century, 206—restrictions on family and social life, 207—intestine controversies, 208—progress since 1860, 209—schools and missions, 210—present number of members, 211—attitude towards the Scriptures, 212—views on the Church, 214; and on Christ's mission, 215—influences favourable to revival, 216.

R

*Rawlinson, Prof. G.*, his 'History of Phœnicia' reviewed, 88.
*Renier, R.*, his work on Dante reviewed, 57.
*Roget, J. L.*, his history of 'Old Water-Colour Society' reviewed, 349.

S

*Scartazzini, G. A.*, his work on Dante reviewed, 57.
*Seeley, J. R.*, his 'Expansion of England' reviewed, 221.
*Shaw, G. B.*, his 'Fabian Essays in Socialism' reviewed, 271.
*Simon, G. E.*, his book on China reviewed, 493.
*Smiles, S.*, his book 'A Publisher and his Friends' reviewed, 121.
*Smith, Goldwin*, his book on Canada reviewed, 221.
*Spencer, Herbert*, his introduction to 'A Plea for Liberty' reviewed, 271.
*Stars, System of the*, review of books concerning, 32—ancient and modern opinions, 32—parallax, 35—practical difficulties in astronomical calculations, 37—distances of nearest stars, 39—sizes of stars, 39—numbering the stars, 41—so-called 'fixed' stars, 42—changes in their positions and colours, 43—meteors and meteorites, 46—spectroscopic analysis of meteorites, 49—theory of star-dust origin of universe, 55.
*Stephen, Miss C. E.*, her book on 'Quaker Strongholds' reviewed, 194.

T

*Tait, Archbishop*, review of his life by Dean Davidson and Canon Benham, 462—early years, 466—in Edinburgh High School and Academy, 467—at Glasgow University, 468—sent to Oxford by a Presbyterian College, 468—Fellow of Balliol and tutor, 469—curate of Baldon, 469—attitude towards Tractarian movement, 471—Head Master of Rugby, 472—Dean of Carlisle, 473—member of University Commission, 474—death of five of his children, 475—Bishop of London, 475—characteristics of his episcopate, 476—Bishop of London's Fund, 479—literary labours, 480—Archbishop of Canterbury, 481—attitude with regard to Irish Church Disestablishment, 483—his conception of a National and Catholic Church, 484—policy of toleration, 487—Public Worship Regulation Act, 488—high ideal of Christian character, 491.

*Talleyrand, Prince de,* review of memoirs of, 1—his dual nature, 3—his defence of his conduct in life, 5—childhood, 7—training at Saint-Sulpice, 7—Agent General of the Clergy, 8—member of Constituent Assembly, mission to London, 11—refuge in England, 13—in America, 15—return to France, 18—Foreign Minister under Directory, 20—Foreign Minister under First Consul, 23—his view of duties of a Foreign Minister, 24—his opinion of acts of the Consulate, 25—opposes attack on Spain, 26—retirement, 28—representative of Louis XVIII. at Congress of Vienna, 29—new light upon his character, 30

*Turner, F. S.,* his book on the Quakers reviewed, 194.

W

*Water Colour Painters,* review of Mr Roget's book concerning, 349—French criticism on their art, 352—Paul Sandby, 354—Hogarth, 355—Gainsborough, 355—topographical drawings, 356—Girtin and Turner, 357—Society of Painters in Water Colours, 362—Associated Artists, 363—second Society of Painters in Water Colours, 364—Royal Institution of Painters in Water Colours, 367—Havel, 368—Harding, 368—Prout, 369—Cotman, 371—David Cox, 371—Copley Fielding, 375

*Wheatley, H B.,* his 'London, Past and Present' reviewed, 152.

END OF VOL. CLXXIV.

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO, NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON